DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 422 069 PS 026 680

TITLE	Caring for America's Children--A Congressional Symposium on Child Care and Parenting. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Children and Families of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources. United States Senate, One Hundred Fifth Congress, Second Session.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, DC. Senate Subcommittee on Children and Families.
REPORT NO	Senate-Hrg-105-452
ISBN	ISBN-0-16-056513-8
PUB DATE	1998-02-23
NOTE	99p.
AVAILABLE FROM	U.S. Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Day Care; Day Care Effects; Early Childhood Education; Family Needs; *Government Role; Hearings; Public Policy
IDENTIFIERS	Child Care Costs; *Child Care Legislation; *Child Care Needs; Congress 105th; Day Care Quality

ABSTRACT

These hearings transcripts present testimony regarding child care before the Senate's Subcommittee on Children and Families. The hearings attempted to answer three questions before action is taken by Congress concerning the care of the nation's children: (1) what is best for children?; (2) what do families really want?; and (3) what truly effective steps can be taken to enable families to provide the best care they can get for their children? Oral and written statements were offered by: (1) Indiana Senator Dan Coats; (2) Diane G. Fisher, a psychologist and policy consultant from the Independent Women's Forum; (3) Dr. Stanley Greensban, a child psychologist; (4) Jay Belsky, a professor of human development and family studies; (5) Dr. Armand Nicholi, a clinician and researcher from Harvard Medical School; (6) Ellen Gallinsky, a representative from the Family and Work Institute; (7) Darcy Olgen, a representative of The Cato Institute; (8) Danielle Crittenden, a representative from The Woman's Quarterly; and (9) Anita Blair, a representative of the Independent Women's Institute. (EV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PS

S. HRG. 105-452

CARING FOR AMERICA'S CHILDREN—A CONGRESSIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON CHILD CARE AND PARENTING

ED 422 069

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED FIFTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

EXAMINING THREE VITAL QUESTIONS WHICH SHOULD BE ADDRESSED BEFORE ACTION IS TAKEN BY THIS CONGRESS CONCERNING THE CARE OF OUR NATION'S CHILDREN. FIRST, WHAT IS BEST FOR CHILDREN? SECOND, WHAT DO FAMILIES REALLY WANT? AND THIRD, WHAT TRULY EFFECTIVE STEPS CAN BE TAKEN TO ENABLE FAMILIES TO PROVIDE THE BEST CARE THEY CAN GET FOR THEIR CHILDREN? IT IS CRITICAL THAT THESE QUESTIONS BE ASKED AND ANSWERED BEFORE FEDERAL SOLUTIONS ARE PROPOSED

FEBRUARY 23, 1998

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
45-890 CC WASHINGTON : 1998

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-056513-8

026680

PS

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont, *Chairman*

DAN COATS, Indiana
JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire
BILL FRIST, Tennessee
MIKE DeWINE, Ohio
MICHAEL B. ENZI, Wyoming
TIM HUTCHINSON, Arkansas
SUSAN M. COLLINS, Maine
JOHN W. WARNER, Virginia
MITCH McCONNELL, Kentucky

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
TOM HARKIN, Iowa
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
PAUL D. WELLSTONE, Minnesota
PATTY MURRAY, Washington
JACK REED, Rhode Island

MARK E. POWDEN, *Staff Director*
SUSAN K. HATTAN, *Deputy Staff Director*
WILLIAM G. DAUSTER, *Minority Chief of Staff and Chief Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

DAN COATS, Indiana, *Chairman*

JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire
TIM HUTCHINSON, Arkansas
SUSAN M. COLLINS, Maine
MITCH McCONNELL, Kentucky
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
(Ex Officio)

CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
PAUL D. WELLSTONE, Minnesota
PATTY MURRAY, Washington
JACK REED, Rhode Island
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
(Ex Officio)

STEPHANIE JOHNSON MONROE, *Staff Director*
DIANA HUFFMAN, *Minority Staff Director*

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1998

	Page
Coats, Hon. Dan, a U.S. Senator from the State of Indiana, opening statement	1
Prepared statement	2
Fisher, Diane G., Ph.D., psychologist and policy consultant, Independent Women's Forum; Dr. Stanley Greenspan, child psychologist, Jay Belsky, Ph.D., distinguished professor of human development and family studies, Penn State University; and Dr. Armand Nicholi, Jr., Harvard Medical School	4
Prepared statements of:	
Ms. Fisher	7
Dr. Greenspan	13
Mr. Belsky	20
Dr. Nicholi	26
Galinsky, Ellen, Family and Work Institute; Darcy Olsen, The Cato Institute; Danielle Crittenden, The Woman's Quarterly; and Anita Blair, Independent Women's Institute	47
Prepared statements of:	
Ms. Galinsky	51
Ms. Olsen	61
Ms. Crittenden	69
Ms. Blair	78

CARING FOR AMERICA'S CHILDREN—A CONGRESSIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON CHILD CARE AND PARENTING

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1998

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND FAMILIES, OF THE
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 1:10 p.m., in Room SDG-50, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Coats, chairman of the subcommittee, presiding.

Present: Senators Jeffords, Coats, Gregg, and Wellstone.

Also Present: Senator Chafee and Representative Wolf.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR COATS

Senator COATS. Good afternoon and welcome to today's Congressional Symposium on Child Care and Parenting entitled "Caring for America's Children." Of all the policy issues that policy makers face, how we care for children has to be at the top of the list. Children are our Nation's future and any policy that is crafted to have an impact on their lives should be thoroughly and carefully and thoughtfully considered.

The purpose of our symposium today is to enter into a discussion of the critical issues impacting children's care, issues which I strongly believe need to be addressed before Congress embarks on what the President has termed the single "largest investment in child care in our Nation's history."

Policy makers need to ask some fundamental and some very basic questions before rushing to legislative solutions, but I think in doing so they need answers to four key questions. The first question: what is best for the children? It seems almost too simplistic and elementary to even raise, yet too often we assume that we know what is best for children without really developing that on a sound basis. What those who have studied the needs of children and worked in the area of children for much of their careers, have had to say about that. So today we will hear from four child care development experts bringing varied perspectives about what is best for children in both the long-term and the short term.

The second question: what do families really want? This question examines the current cultural and work patterns and public opinion polls for insight into what is driving families to work longer hours and spending less time at home and asks the question is this really what families are seeking? We will hear from a labor law ex-

pert and a representative of a leading human resources firm concerning family friendly options and how legal and legislative barriers that prevent employers from offering real alternatives to their employees can be addressed.

Finally, understanding that all families are different, we will ask and explore the problems and solutions to difficulties that face children who grow up without relationships due to family loss, poverty, parental substance abuse, mental illness and family disorganization.

Caring for children is a very complex and emotional issue because while it is true that one segment of our population needs high quality day care in order to work, it is also true that there exists another segment of our population, nearing 70 percent, a majority segment, that do not have both parents engaged in full-time work, and so the question is how do we effectively address the needs of the first segment while ensuring that we are not discouraging or sending wrong signals to the second? How do we ensure the long-term best interests of all children?

Working families struggle to care for their children and often make significant sacrifices to provide for their needs. They should not have to contend with government policies which discriminate against them for choosing to have one parent stay at home or for using informal child care arrangements.

Today's discussion is intended to be a very broad and thoughtful discussion of these and other important issues. We will hear from leading experts in the field, from parents, and other individuals concerned about what is best for children. Families in America face many challenges. They are struggling to do the right thing for their children. Many, however, have received a message from government and media that predefines their choices. Families in America deserve more. They deserve more than political expediency. They deserve to be heard by their policy makers before legislative solutions are implemented.

We have today a distinguished panel of experts before us and I am going to introduce them in a moment. I am also going to announce that we will be visited throughout the day by members of the Senate and members of Congress. This is a day of no votes in the U.S. Senate and the House is not back in session yet, just finishing our President's Day recess, so their schedules have been somewhat interrupted, but we expect some of them to attend and participate in this discussion.

[The prepared statement of Senator Coats follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR COATS

Good afternoon, and welcome to today's Congressional Symposium on Child Care and Parenting—Caring for America's Children.

Of all the issues that policy makers face—how we care for children has to be at the top of the list. Children are our Nation's future. And any policy crafted to have an impact on their lives must be thoroughly, carefully, and very thoughtfully considered.

The purpose of today's symposium is to enter into a discussion of the critical issues impacting children's care—issues which must be addressed before Congress embarks on what the President has

termed "the single largest investment in child care in our Nation's history".

Policy makers need to ask and have the answers to four key questions. First, what is best for children? We will hear from four child development experts from varied perspectives about what is best for children in both the long and short term. Second, what do families want? We will examine current cultural and work patterns and public opinion polls for insight into what is driving families to work longer hours and spending less time at home. Third, we will ask what effective steps can be taken to help families to provide the best care they can for their children? We will hear from a labor law expert and representative of a leading human resources firm concerning family friendly options and how legal and legislative barriers prevent employers from offering real alternatives to their employees. And finally, understanding that all families and children are different, we will ask and explore the problems and solutions to difficulties that face children who grow up without relationships due to family loss, poverty, parental substance abuse or mental illness, and family disorganization.

Caring for children is a very complex and emotional issue because while it is true that one segment of our population needs high-quality day care in order to work, it is also true that there exists another segment of the population, nearly 70 percent, that do not have both parents engaged in full-time work. The question is, how do we effectively address the needs of the first segment, while ensuring that we are not discouraging or sending the wrong signals to the second? How do we ensure the long-term best interests of all children.

Working families struggle to care for their children and often make significant sacrifices to provide for their needs. They should not have to contend with government policies which discriminate against them for choosing to have one parent stay home, or for using informal child care arrangements.

Today's discussion is intended to be a very broad and thoughtful discussion of these and other important issues. We will hear from leading experts in the field, from parents, and other individuals concerned about how we do what's best for kids.

Families in America face many challenges. They are struggling to do the right thing for their children. Many however, have received a message from government and media that defines their choices. Families in America deserve more. They deserve more than political expediency can provide—they deserve to be heard by their policy makers before legislative solutions are implemented.

Senator COATS. Our first panel of speakers include Diane Fisher, a clinical psychologist, mother of three, and board member and spokesperson for the Independent Women's Forum and Mothers at Home. Dr. Fisher has worked intensely with children, families, and adolescents in her private practice, and in the last few years has devoted her time to advocating for the needs of children and families. I might just State to our presenters and to the audience that we have placed a time limit on our speakers because we want to leave plenty of time for discussion. As you know, we have both presenters and a group of experts who will then discuss, ask questions and make points and examine this from a less than structured

standpoint. And so with that in mind and with the idea that we do not want to cut anybody off unnecessarily, there is a hook available here somewhere and all the speakers have been given a limited amount of time to summarize their presentations so that we can have plenty of discussion time.

Dr. Fisher, I want to thank you for taking the time to begin our discussion today, and then I will introduce each of the remaining three presenters before we move to the discussion stage. You are welcome to come to the podium here. I have had to jury-rig this microphone, but I think I can leave some room for your notes so that it will be easy for you to speak to us from this point. Thank you.

STATEMENTS OF DIANE G. FISHER, PH.D., PSYCHOLOGIST AND POLICY CONSULTANT, INDEPENDENT WOMEN'S FORUM; DR. STANLEY GREENSPAN, CHILD PSYCHOLOGIST; JAY BELSKY, Ph.D., DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILY STUDIES, PENN STATE UNIVERSITY; AND DR. ARMAND NICHOLI, JR., HARVARD MEDICAL SCHOOL

Ms. FISHER. Good afternoon. I am happy to be able to speak about this issue, something I feel very passionately about. We as women have had a kind of unspoken agreement over the last 15 or 20 years that we could not question day care because if we did it would hurt women. I think this false choice has not brought happiness to any of us and has not brought happiness to our children. I think that women are starting to become willing to question this and to try and think of creative solutions that do not automatically lead to the conclusion that we will be hurting women's financial choices or freedom of choice.

We have suffered from not questioning this day care situation, how to balance work and family before, and our children have suffered. We are all concerned about low-income parents. We are all concerned about at-risk families, and I certainly agree with Senator Coats that that needs to be a separate policy question from what I am going to focus on today, which is healthy functioning families, which are the majority, at least 80 percent of the parents in this country today. We can then ask what is best for children in a healthy functioning family since that is what I am going to focus on.

What do we wish as a country at this juncture? To foster a policy of encouraging parents to leave their babies in the earliest months for full-time employment? Do we believe a system of substitute care, 21st century schools, night care, sick-child care, summer care, weekend care, whatever the workplace demands, is best or even adequate for our children? And is it what the country wants? We need a cohesive long-term national policy. And that is why this conversation is so important today. Most parents have decided that two full-time working parents is not a good model for raising children. Very few parents prefer it for themselves, only about one third of the parents of young children, and very few think it best for their children. An Independent Women's Forum poll suggested 15 percent thought the dual-career model was ideal.

Furthermore, polls show that parents do not believe they can do the best job possible parenting their children when they are trying

to hold down two careers. That should surprise no one in the room. The actual choices being made, I believe, are informative. 66 percent of all children below age 6 are cared for by a mother who works part time or is unemployed. I do not think the 66 percent represents mothers who are not able to find adequate full-time day care. I think the 66 percent reflects a real choice and a real sacrifice and a real commitment that that family, husband and wife, is willing to make.

The quality promise. We hear a lot about high quality and the sort of endless sky-high potential of if we could just improve the quality of day care. We would like to think that high quality is a win-win situation. Recently in my neighborhood I saw a fully licensed accredited Kinder-care van driving through my neighborhood. It was very early, still dark outside. My kids were not up for school yet. They were picking up half-asleep preschoolers, strapping them in car seats where they sat dazed and slumped, going around to pick up everyone else in the preschool class. Why is this acceptable? When will we set a limit and say this is not good for young children?

The military day care system, of which I am a past consumer, has been held up as a model for high quality center-based care everywhere, and they are state-of-the-art physical facilities. There are kind, benign, trained, accredited caregivers, but the children still take their naps on little rows of mats on the floor, they still eat at little formica tables, they still sit in the corner waiting for mommy. There is nothing more closely watched at mid-afternoon than the front-door of a day care center, and anyone who doubts that I would ask you to walk in sometime after 1:30 or two. The children are waiting. There is an expression of longing on every face. What are we saying to our children putting them in this position?

Infants and children placed in day care are at a vulnerable, nonverbal, needy stage of their lives, and we are trying to train caregivers to rise to the occasion and manifest the kind of sensitive love these children need over the course of a long eight or ten-hour day. How successful are we? Consider. The military and Head Start programs have learned through hard experience that the way to maintain high quality in day care centers is through constant monitoring and unannounced checks by inspectors. Why? Does a good mother require unannounced checks by inspectors? Or can I trust something that remains adequate only because I am monitoring it or using a camera to monitor it?

On some level we have found that caregivers in day care centers lack the intrinsic motivation to stay with the child and give them the kind of sensitive care that is simply not trainable. Can this situation be optimal for children? Day care as a tool or back-up used in limited amounts makes sense and this is the kind of choice that parents are reflecting in their choices to work part-time, telecommute, flex time, work at home. Limited amounts are one thing, but they do not reinvent the parent high quality notwithstanding.

The public is confused and the polls reflect that. They are encouraged to believe the promises of higher quality and to believe that all problems with day care are just because the center is not funded well enough or a day care provider is not trained well

enough. And the polls reflect if their child had just the right care, then they would be able to work full time. This is some parents. In fact, poll after poll shows the high turnover, the fickle loyalties to different day care centers, parents continually searching. They keep looking for day care A and they keep ending up in day care B. I think that day care A is an illusion. Day care A is the parent. And I think that the confusion about that is what we have sold to the public as sort of the endless possibility.

The emotional bind of mothers is the last thing I want to comment on. Mothers are not supposed to have to choose between children and work. It is a false choice. We are not supposed to feel torn. We are supposed to be able to do it all. And I thought the 1980's got rid of this, but in this new debate I have seen that we are holding on to this picture. Arlie Hochschild refers to this as the new "emotional asceticism." We minimize our children's needs and we minimize our own needs enough that we can imagine that everyone is doing fine. I read a recent letter to a women's magazine where a woman talked about how she had had a wonderful nanny, how her children missed out on nothing, and she felt absolutely no guilt, and it all worked out just fine with one small problem. Years later when her grown daughter was living in Australia and called her on the phone, she said that after her mother left for work, she used to hide in the closet and smell her mother's clothes. The mother was unaware of this deep emotional hunger. She had denied that the child was suffering in this way.

Our culture has misled parents and is continuing to do it without awareness of the damaging consequences. New parents are receiving the message that baby will be better off in day care or at least equal in day care. It has glamorized day care and the potential for that. We must correct the cultural message and support parents turning back to their children and new parents understanding how central they are. Few child advocates here today believe a young child is better off in full-time substitute care. Even fewer advocates here today believe infants are better in substitute full-time care. If we believe that at-home parenting is best for young children, we must not be afraid to say it or to help new parents become competent and skilled. If we are more concerned about sexual equality or reconstructing the American family, then let us not call ourselves child advocates.

Everyone in this room has an opportunity for leadership on this issue. Our imaginations have been constricted by a constant barrage of images of working women and preschools full of babies. Many parents no longer even dare hope that staying home is possible. I hear this all the time. They do not even think their daughters will have the option of staying home and raising their children. We need awarenesses of our own biases and fears, self-awareness of the broader consequences of our statements regarding day care, and finally we must not destroy hope by one-sided references to economic reality or progress. Our predictions have great power. Thank you.

Senator COATS. Dr. Fisher, thank you very much for a thoughtful presentation.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Fisher follows:]

INDEPENDENT WOMEN'S FORUM

Statement of Diana G. Fleker, Ph.D.
Psychologist and Policy Consultant, Independent Women's Forum
CARING FOR AMERICA'S CHILDREN – Congressional Symposium

Feb. 23, 1998

In the end, what is best for children is best for all of us. Thus, the question, "what is best for children?", must stand alone from what is best for employers, or the economy, or what is best for women. These questions are often confused, and they must not be.

The question , "What is best for children who live in families who are financially hopeless?" must be considered separately. These children need high quality, affordable care and their families need hope of improving their situation, financially and educationally. Middle-income and affluent families, who are able to parent and able to make financial choices do not need the same policy.

The question, "what is best for children whose parents are dysfunctional or unable to care for them?", must also drive separate policy. These children make up roughly 15 to 20% of the children in this country. Certainly, this percentage is too high. We need to move forward with intensive early programs for both the mother and the child, programs like Healthy Families, a young parent education program which has been used in 154 sites in 28 states with great success. Whenever possible, we must help the parent learn and develop rather than replacing her or him....since we know as psychologists, the impact of the parent, good or bad, absent or not, is lifelong.

We can then ask, "What is best for the child who has two average parents?" Do we wish, as a country, to frame a policy of encouraging parents to leave their babies in the earliest months, for full-time employment? Do we believe a system of substitute care, 21st Century subsets, night-care, sick-child care, summer care and weekend care – whenever the workplace demands – is best (or even adequate) for our young children? And is it what the country wants? We need a cohesive national policy.

Most parents have decided that two-full-time working parents is not a good model for raising children. Very few parents prefer it for themselves (only about one-third) and very few think it best for their children (i.e. 15% in 1996 IWF poll). Furthermore, most parents do not believe they can be the parents they'd like to be when they are juggling parenting and full-time work (i.e. Pew poll 1997, National Commission on Children poll, 1994). The actual choices parents make are informative ...The 1996 Census Bureau data shows that 66% of all children below age six are cared for by a mother who works part-time or is unemployed. This number rises when tag-teaming, parenting by Dad and mothers with more than one child are added in. The division between "at-home mother" and "working mother" is vanishing, parents are making real choices and finding solutions.

Why aren't we seeing more dual-career parents? In my experience with parents, lack of safe, affordable care is not the primary obstacle to working full-time. Most parents do not consider raising their children a waste of time, or secondary to professional achievement. Many are willing to make the financial sacrifice (now an average of $20,000 less than dual-career families) to have an at-home parent.

2111 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 550, Arlington, Virginia 22201-3057 • Telephone 703/243-8989 Fax 703/243-9230

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A mahogany-paneled hearing room is miles away from the simple needs of children. We have become clever at word use, and precisely phrased polls and statistics. So I find it helpful to use images to illustrate the problem with our use of the phrase "quality" day-care, and to illustrate the emotional cost to women of leaving their children in the early years.

The Quality Promise - We would like to think that providing high-quality care is a win-win situation. Recently, I saw a fully licensed, accredited Kinder-care van driving through my neighborhood quite early in the morning, picking up half-asleep pre-schoolers who sat dazed, slumped in their car-seats - it was still dark outside. Why is this acceptable? The military day-care system has been held up as a model for high-quality centers everywhere. I remember taking my son to a state-of-the-art military day-care center a couple of years ago. No matter how high-quality and trained the caregivers are, the children still take their naps on little rows of mats on the floor, line up to eat at little *Formica* tables, with food wheeled in on a stainless steel restaurant cart, and curl up in the corner waiting for recovery. There is nothing more closely watched, from mid-afternoon on, than the front door of a day-care classroom. The first Mommy to enter at the end of the day sees the expressions of longing and hope on every face.... children waiting.

Infants and children are placed in day-care at the most vulnerable needy stage of their lives, when most of their communication is subtle and non-verbal, when their emotional outbursts and testing requires enormous emotional containment. We are trying to train caregivers to rise to the occasion and manifest the kind of sensitive love these children need. How successful are we? Consider: the military and Head-Start programs have learned through hard experience that the way to maintain high-quality in day-care centers is through constant monitoring and unannounced checks by inspectors. Why? Does a good mother require unannounced checks to keep her from slipping in her parenting? Can I trust something that sustains adequate only because I am popping in to monitor? Or using a camera? On some level, we have found that caregivers and day-care centers require this because the relevant motivation to love the child is not present, the devotion that a parent has is simply not attainable. Can this situation be optimal for children? Day-care as a tool or back-up, used in limited realistic amounts makes sense. It does not begin to resolve the parent.

The public is confused – they are encouraged to believe the promises of "higher quality" and to believe that their existing problems with day-care have been because the caregiver was not trained properly or the center was not funded well enough. Some polls reflect this wish - IF their children had JUST THE RIGHT day-care, THEN they would be comfortable working longer hours. But the perfect day-care does not exist - no matter how much money is spent. We are enticed by the promise, but the *REALITY* is always different. As a result, we see poll after poll citing parent's dissatisfaction with their present day-care situation, a high turnover, fickle loyalties to one center, a constant parental questioning and doubt that this situation is best for their child. And they are absolutely right. We parents keep hoping to find day-care "A" and we keep ending up in day-care "B" because day-care "A" is us. It cannot be bought. It's that simple.

What will happen to the employee when day-care "B" the day-care he is not quite comfortable with, is his employer's on-site day-care center? Parental status and measuring will not rid us of this uncomfortable issue.

The Hidden Emotional Bind – Mothers deciding between work and their children are in a painful emotional bind. Our society does not support maternal attachment or acknowledge a mother's maternal feelings. We value signs of competence, early socialization or adaptability even though these are not the primary goals of the zero to three period. Arlie Hochschild refers to this as the new "emotional asceticism", parents learning to cope with the conflict by denying the deep emotional needs of the family. Recently, there was a poignant letter in a popular women's magazine. The mother, who apparently worked full-time when her children were young, wrote in defense of full-time work, stating that she had never had

any guilt or misgivings leaving for work, and that her children had always been happy with their nanny and had missed out on nothing. Years later, she wrote, her grown daughter had her first son used to "bathe in the closet, smelling her mother's clothes" when her mother had left for work. Sadly, this is a symptom of deep emotional hunger and longing. The mother was in denial and unaware of her children's pain.

Correcting the Cultural Message - Our culture has misled parents without awareness of the damaging consequences. It has glamorized day-care, working and having it all. We must correct the cultural message -- and decide to support parents turning back toward their children. Further, we, as professionals and child-care advocates, must shore up vulnerable parents who are questioning their commitment to their children. Few child advocates here today believe a young child is BETTER OFF in full-time substitute care. Even fewer believe infants belong in full-time care. If we believe that at-home parenting is best for young children -- we must not be afraid to say it, or to help new parents become confident and skilled.

Everyone in this room has an opportunity for leadership on this issue. Our imaginations have been constricted by a constant barrage of images of working women and pre-school day-care. many parents no longer even dare hope that staying home is possible, or will be a viable option for their daughters. We need awareness of our own biases, and self-awareness of the broader consequences of our statements regarding day-care. Finally, we must not destroy hope by one-sided references to "economic reality" or "progress." Our predictions have power.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Senator COATS. Our second speaker is Dr. Stanley Greenspan. I am pleased to welcome him here. I am sure many are familiar with his work in the area of child psychiatry. Dr. Greenspan is currently Clinical Professor of Psychiatry, Behavioral Sciences and Pediatrics at the George Washington University Medical School, and also a practicing child psychiatrist. He has received numerous awards for his work and is the author of many scholarly and popular books. Dr. Greenspan, we appreciate your being with us and look forward to your presentation.

Dr. GREENSPAN. Thank you very much, and it is a real pleasure and honor to be here with you today. My part of the agenda will be to try to create a framework for the discussion that we are having about child care by looking at what infants and young children need to grow healthy brains and healthy minds. And we have called these the irreducible needs of infants and young children. We have all been, I think, pleased to see over these last few years that neuroscience research had documented what many of us have known clinically and what many child care observers have been witnessing over many years: that early experiences are critical experiences, are critical for the growth of not only a healthy mind but also a healthy brain. So now we have documented that the right kind of sounds or the right kinds of sights actually change the wiring of the brain, and we come into the world with a genetic blueprint, but the actual way that blueprint becomes adapted, the way the wiring of the brain occurs, and the way it grows is through experiences, through interactive experiences.

We know that positive experiences lead to more neuronal connections, richer brain growth, richer cognitive growth, richer growth of emotional and social skills, and we know that the wrong kind of stimulation or lack of stimulation can provide negative consequences in terms of both brain growth and the growth of the mind. In recent years we have been able to identify critical types of experiences that are necessary for building healthy minds and healthy brains, and we call these, again, the irreducible needs.

First and foremost is providing safety, security and protection. Every infant and child requires an environment that provides these ingredients, yet many babies even before they are born are exposed to intrauterine experiences that endanger the growth of their brains: smoking, alcohol, other toxic substances. These are all well known. Also well known are the fact that chaotic or depriving environments seriously compromise a baby's ability to take in sights and sounds. But also less well known is the fact that overly impersonal or insensitive care by caregivers who are inexperienced or in settings where they must care for too many babies at once can compromise these basic abilities as well. In contrast, loving caregivers who patiently learn how their baby's nervous system works and find optimal patterns of touch, sound, sight and rhythmic movement and optimal emotional cuing establish the foundations for learning and security.

Now, our second irreducible need has to do with ongoing, and I underline the word "ongoing," intimate relationships. We now know that the human relationship between a baby and a caregiver is probably the single most important element in learning in terms of

intellectual development but also social and emotional development. Warm relationships lasting years, not weeks or months, are essential for our capacities to love, form relationships, participate in groups and communities, and eventually to have the self-reflective abilities needed to govern ourselves. We have recently discovered that ongoing intimate relationships are also vital for our capacity to reason and solve problems and be reflective. So our progress in school and academically also results from the back and forth of these early relationships.

Some infants grow up without relationships due to wars, poverty, parental substance abuse or mental illness or family disorganization. Even children who are fortunate enough to escape these dire consequences, however, are at risk. Many of our children now are growing up during the infancy and early childhood years in some form of large group setting, often center-based day care. Yet according to a large multisite study coordinated by the University of Colorado, over 80 percent of center-based day care is not viewed of high quality, not viewed as providing these essential experiences for healthy growth of healthy brains and healthy minds. The Families and Work Institute, and we will be hearing from Ellen Galinsky shortly, found that in family day care and other more informal arrangements, we have some of these same challenges that we saw in center-based day care. The Commonwealth Fund recently reported that the majority of States have inadequate child care regulations. Furthermore, even in high quality, the small number that are viewed as high quality day care, and well regulated day care, also small numbers, even in those centers when you observe carefully, you see that caregivers are changing yearly because kids go from the infant room to the toddler room to the pre-school room and so forth. No one would advocate changing mothers or fathers yearly, and many of the children are in day care for 30 plus hours a week so these are surrogate parents to the babies.

Also, because of low wages, often poor incentives, poor training, there is a lot of staff turnover in many centers. So it is not only yearly changeovers, but sometimes two or three times a year babies are having to experience an unnecessary separation and a readjustment to another adult. Again, these are not just a pre-school teacher two or three hours a day, this is another mommy or another daddy in the baby's life. So here we have a system that we have not looked at very closely. There are some places doing innovative things where they have the same caregiver staying with the same babies for a period of many years.

People talk about the Israeli kibbutz as a model. There they had the same person often staying with the babies for many years.

The recent findings from the National Institute of Child Health and Development Study emphasizes that quality counts wherever you find it, but when this study is coupled with the fact that most day care at present does not seem to be of high quality, we have cause for concern. What will be the implications for future generations if we begin having a system of care for babies and toddlers, not older children, babies and toddlers, that does not optimize the growth of healthy minds and healthy brains? We can expect future generations of adults to be more impulsive, more concrete in their thinking, more passive and helpless, and less reflective, and less

reflective means less able to participate in a democratic society because you will not have the judgment necessary. And that, to me, is very, very worrisome as we begin to advocate out-of-home care as the desired option rather than as, I will come to later, a back-up system for those who need it. And it should be a good back-up system for those who need it but not the desired first choice, not for the kids in their first 3 years of life.

A third irreducible need: emotional interactions geared to the child's developmental needs and level. We have discovered that cognitive stimulation as such, flash cards, puzzles, many types of educational toys, is not what helps children learn to reason, think and problem solve. Rather subtle, everyday emotional interactions are the foundations for both emotional and intellectual health. For example, a baby learns about causality not by pulling a string to ring a bell, but by pulling on mommy's heartstrings with a smile and getting a smile back, or pulling on daddy's heartstrings with a frown and getting a frown back or another caregiver, a grandmother, an aunt or even a day care provider, but it is the back and forth interaction that count.

Similarly, a 16-month old toddler taking someone's hand, walking to the toy area and pointing to the toy they want, is their first experience in problem solving. Later on pretend play on the floor with the animals hugging or going to the doctor or even having a fight is the basis for creative thinking and eventually for logic as the kids cannot go out because it is raining and they learn to think logically through the pretend play and through lots of debates and lots of dialogues. But to have these experiences requires a loving, sensitive caregiver involved for long interactive sequences, first pre-verbally and then verbally, with your growing toddler and preschooler. And that is hard to find when you have children in settings with initially four children in the baby years to one adult in the most optimal day care settings and later on where you have six or more children per adult for toddlers and pre-schoolers because kids have a hard time learning from each other until they are about three. You get a lot of nice parallel play, but more often when it is interactive it is short, and you are dependent on children being very precocious to get a lot of their social needs met in a large group. Most kids cannot handle ten or 15 kids. They can handle one or two kids and learn from other children. So we need better adult to child interactions to promote these interactive learning experiences that are the foundation for our intellect.

Now, we also have other irreducible needs, and I do not have the time to go into each of them. I will just mention them in highlight. Gearing experiences to each child's nervous system. Again, that is best done with caregivers who are with children for many years, who know the children well, and where the numbers are not too large. Also, children need limits and expectations, which is self-evident to most of you, I think. And they need family, neighborhood and cultural continuity, and these are the irreducible needs.

Now, if we stop providing these irreducible needs as a matter of preference, if more and more of our children are in settings where they cannot be met, our society in the future will have again children growing into adults who are unable to think, unable to be reflective and unable to parent themselves and unable to lead fami-

lies. When we look at studies of outcomes, we have to look at not just cognitive growth in a test driven assessment of cognition or language development and the test driven assessment of language, we have to look at the abilities that will lead our children to eventually be able to be healthy parents, to empathize, to nurture, to love others and to be reflective citizens, to make complex gray area judgments, and that is hard to measure in early childhood. We need longitudinal studies watching people into adulthood before we can make assessments of that. But that is what is at risk here if we do not do it right.

I recommend three things that we consider based on what we now know about what children need. One, that we need to create incentives and educational tools to help parents who are able to, who are emotionally secure, have healthy family lives, and who want to care for their kids, we need to give them incentives to have them care for their infants and toddlers because right now new parents coming into parenthood are being given a mixed message.

Two, we need to improve care in all settings, at home through education starting in high school and college, and also we need to strengthen day care as a back-up system for those who need it. There are clearly single parents who must work, two parents who have to work, and they need good day care as a back-up. We have to improve day care.

And three, and I will end with this before I get the hook, is that we need to improve our programs for at-risk children. There are children at risk due to environmental circumstances and children at risk due to biological risk factors such as being born too early or because of various kinds of physical or mental illnesses, and we need to have better programs for at risk. Thank you very much.

Senator COATS. Doctor, thank you.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Greenspan follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. STANLEY GREENSPAN

Age-old observations, a well a the latest neuroscience research, reveal that experiences early in life are critical for a healthy mind ad brain. We now know that the human brain is only partially formed at birth and that early experiences can change the actual physical structure and wiring of the brain. For example, extra interactive experiences with looking or listening increase the neuronal connections in the parts of the brain responsible for comprehending sights or sounds. Not all experiences or stimulation is the same, however. Excessive stimulation, fearful experiences, stress or deprivation can interfere with neuronal connections, alter brain chemistry, and undermine healthy development.

In recent years, we have been able to identify the critical types of experiences that are necessary for building healthy brains and minds. These critical experiences can be thought of as *the irreducible needs of infants and children.* Below we will review these critical requirements for a healthy mind and look at how well we are meeting them.[1]

1. **Safety, Security, and Protection.** Every infant and child requires an environment that provides these ingredients, yet many babies, even before they are born, are exposed to intrauterine experiences that endanger the growth of their brains. Smoking, alcohol, and other toxic substances undermine the growth of a healthy nervous system that is able optimally to process sensations (sights and sounds), as well as organize thoughts and plan and implement appropriate actions. Chaotic or depriving environments can also seriously compromise the baby's ability

[1] See Greenspan, S.I. (1997). *The Growth of the Mind and the Endangered Origins of Intelligence.* Reading, MA: Addison Wesley Longman. for a more detailed discussion of the children's irreducible needs and the experiences critical for healthy brains and minds, a well a the challenges we face in the future.

to take in sights and sounds and make sense of his or her world. Overly impersonal or insensitive care by caregivers who are inexperienced or in setting where they must care for a number of babies at once can also compromise these basic abilities. In contrast, loving caregivers who patiently learn how their baby's nervous system works and find the optimal patterns of touch, sounds, sights, and rhythmic movement establish the foundations for learning and security.

2. **Ongoing, Intimate Relationships.** Warm relationships lasting years, not weeks or months, are essential for our capacities to love, form friendships, participate in groups and communities, and eventually govern ourselves. We have recently discovered that ongoing, intimate relationships are also vital for our capacity to reason, solve problems, and be reflective. Ongoing intimate, loving relationships, however, can no longer be taken for granted for the majority of our babies.

Some infants grow up without relationships, due to wars, poverty, parental substance abuse or mental illness, and family disorganization. Even children who are fortunate enough to escape these dire circumstances are at risk, however. Over half of parents with infants under age one are working and most of their infants or young children grow up in some form of non-parental care (e.g., day care). Yet, according to a large multi-site study coordinated by the University of Colorado at Denver, over 80 percent of center-based care is inadequate.[2] The Families and Work Institutes found similar trends for family day care[3] and the Commonwealth Fund reported that the majority of states have inadequate child care regulations.[4] Furthermore, in the majority of day care centers caregivers change each year as the infant goes from the baby room to the toddler room to the preschool room and so forth. In addition, due to minimum wages and poor training, there is a great deal of staff turnover, leading many babies to experience three or four caregivers in a given year. No one would advocate deliberately changing parents each year or many times a year.

Many of our nation's babies are in day care most or all of each day with inadequate care and changing caregivers. A major study from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development finds that it is the quality of care in the home or day care setting that influences early development. When this study is coupled with the studies that are finding that most care is not of high quality and that it is difficult for day care to provide stable, loving, caregivers over a number of years, there is cause for enormous concern. What are the implications for future generations?

3. **Emotional Interactions Geared to the Child's Developmental Needs and Level.** We have discovered that cognitive stimulation as such (e.g., flash cards, puzzles, or many types of educational toys) is not what enable children to learn to reason, think, and problem-solve. Rather, subtle, everyday emotional interactions are the foundation of both emotional and intellectual health. For example, way before an infant pulls on a string to ring a bell (which Piaget described as the first sign of causal thinking), a baby pulls on his mother's heart strings with his smiles and when he gets a smile back, he is receiving his very first lesson in causality. Similarly, a sixteen-month-old toddler taking his Dad's hand and pointing to the toy chest and motioning "open," is learning his first lessons in complex communication, problem-solving, and scientific reasoning. A two-and-a-half-year-old creating a drama where her dolls are feeding the baby dolls held by Mommy is learning about creativity and language, and a three-and-a-half-year-old arguing the merits of a later bedtime is learning to be an abstract, logical thinker. Even math concepts of quantity are learned from emotional expectations; a lot is more than the child expects and a little is less than he wants. Numbers eventually systematize these subjective impressions. In one study we found that children with healthy family support and these kinds of emotional interactions were twenty times more likely than those without them to have normal to superior intelligence.

We have identified six types of these formative interactions that build healthy minds.[5] Each of these requires a dedicated, sensitive caregiver to serve as an interactive partner in to master the new types of learning, be they preverbal problem-solving in the second year of life (a critical foundation for all later social skills and

---

[2] Helburn, S. et al. (1995). *Cost, Quality, and Child Outcomes in Child Care Centers.* Public Report. Denver: Department of Economics, Center for Research in Economic and Social Policy. University of Colorado Denver.

[3] Galinsky, E., Howes, C., Kontos, S., Shinn, M. (1994). *The Study of Children in Family Child Care and Relative Care: Highlights of Findings.* Boston, MA: Families and Work Institute.

[4] Commonwealth Fund in collaboration with Yale University researchers study on state day care regulations. Published in *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. Exact reference to follow.*

[5] See Greenspan, S.I. (1997). *The Growth of the Mind and the Endangered Origins of Intelligence.* Reading, M.A: Addison Wesley Longman.

scientific thought) or creative and abstract thinking in the third and fourth year of life.

The long interactive, preverbal and verbal dialogues that help children master these important human capacities also cannot be taken for granted as routine. Stressful, chaotic or traumatic environments clearly rob children of these needed interactions. These types of interactions are also less likely in the typical day care setting which cares for over half our nation's children. Consider that even in the best centers, during the first year of life, day care staff often care for four babies each and in the toddler and preschool years, often six or more. We frequently have observed many an eager, expectant eight-month-old baby give up and stare at the wall as his caregiver stops by his crib briefly but then hurries away to attend to a crying rival. In the toddler years, more of the interactions are between peers, which makes it difficult for the less social children to obtain the interactions they require.

4. **Gearing Experiences to Each Child's Nervous System.** We've discovered differences in children's nervous systems that lead them to differ in the way they take in sights and sounds and plan and execute their actions. These differences in their nervous systems include sensitivity to sights, sounds, and touch, under reactivity to these sensations, difficulty in planning and sequencing responses, craving lots of sensory input and activity, and difficulty with comprehending sounds, words, or complex sights. Yet, we have also found out how to create learning experiences for each type of nervous system.

Such experiences can help an active, sensory-craving child become a bold, confident, explorative leader, capable of compassion and empathy rather than a youngster prone to violence and anti-social patterns. Our current child-rearing patterns, educational approaches, and social service, health and mental health systems only rarely recognize or deal with these individual differences. In large settings with many children, it is often more difficult to create individualized learning experiences. In addition, for a variety of reasons not yet entirely clear, perhaps due to chaotic early environments and/or exposure to substances that damage the nervous system, more and more children appear to evidence the extremes of these individual differences for which it is harder to formulate successful remedies.

5. **Limits and Expectations.** Children also require firm, but gentle limits. Furthermore, they need expectations that are within their grasp while extending their reach. It's becoming more and more difficult for families to balance the need for empathy and support with limits and guidance. Children from chaotic or disorganized families rarely have either, experiencing instead vacillations between over-permissiveness, over punitiveness. Even more organized and seemingly secure families, however, are often so overextended that they, too, vacillate rather than balance. Children in full-time day care as well as after-school day care programs must rely on the guidance and limits from a large children's group as well as a changing staff.

6. **Neighborhood and Cultural Continuity.** To form a healthy sense of self, children require cultural continuity and a stable community. In addition to their families, from about age seven on, children's identities are gradually more and more formed from their participation in groups. Through the grade-school years and into the adolescent years, values, goals, and aspirations are the product of children's experiences in the family, peer group, school, and larger cultural and community settings. When, due to overly busy or stressed families, dangerous schools and neighborhoods, or cultural dissolution these social settings become unpredictable, fragmented, frightening, or overly polarized into (extreme viewpoints), the opportunities for children to form balanced expectations and integrated identities are often compromised.

As we can see, meeting the "irreducible needs" and preparing children for their futures is not an easy task. Furthermore, changing social patterns may be taking us farther away from mastering this task.

We may in fact be at an evolutionary crossroads. In addition to the challenge of stressed communities, poverty, and disorganized families, for the first time in history, there is a growing trend for more and more middle and upper-middle class parents to farm out the care of their babies to others, often in settings not conducive to meeting children's irreducible needs. Impersonal child care may be only the most obvious symptom of a society that is moving toward impersonal modes of communication, education, and health and mental health care. Major societal changes are clearly necessary. Unfortunately, the consequences of not making changes may not be immediately obvious. The impact will likely be slow and insidious. People may gradually become more self-centered and less concerned with others. Thinking may become more polarized, all or nothing, rather than subtle and reflective. Impulsive behavior, helplessness, and depression may increase. The ability for self-awareness

and problem-solving may decrease, as will our capacity to live together and govern ourselves in cohesive communities. Consider some trends already in evidence.

- As indicated, over 50 percent of children are growing up in types of non-parental care, yet studies suggest that over 80 percent of day care centers are not of high quality and most are not appropriately regulated.
- The Center for Disease Control in Atlanta recently reported that the United States has the highest rate of adolescent homicide and suicide (both impulsive actions) among all the industrialized nations. There is also growing drug use among children.
- At the same time, studies reveal that adolescent risk-taking (including violence, drugs, and sexual promiscuity) is significantly reduced when there are strong and empathetic relationships with family, teachers, or mentors. Yet, these most critical relationships are what we appear to be reducing.
- In addition, increasingly we are unable to care for others. Rates of child abuse and neglect by parents are going up, and in some communities, over 50 percent of fetuses are damaged by maternal alcohol and drug abuse and poor prenatal care.

We are still in a position to actively choose which direction to go in—toward respecting the importance of critical types of human interaction for healthy brains and minds or toward greater self-absorption, impulsivity, polarized thinking, helplessness, an-or violence. If we wait too long to choose our direction, future generations may well lack the self-reflectiveness necessary to be aware of what is missing and to determine what collective actions are necessary.

Therefore, a major national and international effort is necessary to put our understanding of the irreducible needs of children into practice, involving:

- Educating our children about human development during their formative school years and in college so that they're prepared for their most critical role as a parent and a family member.
- Incentives for business and parents to enable parents to reclaim rearing their children, especially in the early years, and still have the opportunity for successful careers. For example, the *4/3 solution* would enable each parent to work 2/3 of the time, providing 2/3 direct care for their child. Obviously such a solution and an array of improvements in parental leave, flex time, job sharing, and part-time work options would require cooperation by industry, aided by tax and other incentives.
- Revitalizing our commitment to our most vulnerable children and families (i.e., those with social, emotional, and/or physical disabilities) so that new generations of children from all walks of life truly have equal access to opportunity.
- A re-examination and re-formulation of the assumptions and values underlying our education, social service, health and mental health systems, and our justice system, coupled with new regulations and practices.

For example, at present

- Infants and children with developmental disabilities are discriminated against as speech therapy or occupational therapy is often not allowed under many managed care, HMO, and/or health insurance plans, while more expensive surgical procedures are covered.
- Difficult children go from one foster home to another because of too little training and/or financial incentives.
- As part of divorce proceedings, the justice system often unknowingly separates infants from their primary caregivers for days or weeks on end during especially sensitive early periods of development, thereby disrupting early mental development.
- Many orphanages and other settings for children without parents, or removed from parents, fail to create experiences which meet the most minimal of the irreducible needs described earlier. For example, in many settings for infants, there is no ongoing intimate relationship with a caregiver.

Current priorities and practices unfortunately fail to reflect the importance of our children to the world's future. Therefore, to underline and improve our ability to meet the irreducible needs of children, we should initiate a *periodic national and international* report card (including a region-by-region or nation-by-nation analysis) *on institutions and practices in light of the irreducible needs of each of our children.*

Senator COATS. It is truly presumptuous for a senator who is given unlimited time to speak on the Senate floor to limit people with such great expertise to such a short amount of time to share a lifetime of experiences in research and study with us. And I apologize for that. The purpose, however, is to allow us the opportunity to get into a good back-and-forth discussion in which everybody will be involved, and I appreciate your indulgence with that.

I want to acknowledge the fact that we have been joined by two of my colleagues, first the chairman of the Health and Human Services Committee in the U.S. Senate, my chairman, Jim Jeffords, from Vermont; and Frank Wolf, who has spent a lifetime, particularly his time in Congress, focusing on issues of family and children, and one of the leading sponsors of a number of initiatives in this regard. Both have indicated to me they are here to listen and learn, as I am. We certainly want their participation in the discussion and if either wants to make comments, I am certainly willing to offer them that opportunity.

Our next speaker, Professor Jay Belsky, Distinguished Professor, comes to us from Penn State University where he teaches human development. Professor Belsky has received several awards for his work and has done extensive scholarly writing on the subject of child development and human development with particular attention to families. And so we welcome and thank Professor Belsky for being with us today.

Mr. BELSKY. Thank you very much. It is a pleasure to be here. This afternoon I would like to address the effects of early child care on parenting and the parent-child relationship by summarizing results from two recent investigations. The first is a ten-site, federally funded NICHD Study of Early Child Care which involves more than 1,300 children and families. The perspective I bring to bear on the findings of this study should be regarded as exclusively my own and may not be shared by many of my collaborators. The second study I will make reference to is a much smaller one, involving some 130 working and middle class families raising firstborn sons in central Pennsylvania.

Before summarizing findings regarding parenting and the parent-child relationship, I want to highlight the most consistent results to emerge from the NICHD study. Namely, those concerning the effects of child care quality. Virtually, wherever we have looked, we have found that the higher the quality of child care that children experience, the better their psychological and behavioral functioning. Thus, we find that children who experience more sensitive, responsive, and stimulating child care across the first years of life are cognitively and linguistically better off and are more socially cooperative with age mates and adults. Important to note, though, is that the very findings that underscore such positive effects of child care quality simultaneously show that the lower the quality of child care that children experience, the poorer their functioning. This latter way of framing the findings seems important to me in light of evidence that the average quality of care in the United States is only mediocre if not poor.

However, the findings regarding quality are framed, it is important to emphasize that the magnitude of effects we are discerning are by no means large. In some respects, then, questions can and perhaps should be raised about the impact that modest improvements in child care quality would have on child development. Put more simply, how much bang can we expect from the buck invested in improving child care quality?

Having drawn attention to this critical issue, one that I for one will not try to resolve today, I want to turn attention to the effect of early child care on parenting and the parent-child relationship.

This is an important topic because as my mentor, Urie Bronfenbrenner of Cornell University, compellingly argued almost 25 years ago, early experiences that affect the parent-child relationship may be especially influential in shaping child development over the long-term because this relationship represents an enduring feature of the child's life.

In light of such theory regarding the importance of the parent-child relationship, one major goal of the NICHD study of early child care was to illuminate the conditions under which routine child care enhanced or undermined children's relationships with their mothers. Two years ago, our group reported the first formal results of the NICHD study. Although some media reports indicated that no effects of early child care on infant-mother attachment security were discerned, this was not the case. Even though no feature of child care by itself, be it quality or quantity, stability or type of care, predicted whether a child would be classified as secure or insecure, there were a number of interesting findings that all pointed in a singular direction which we described as the condition of dual risk.

More specifically, when the quality of a mother's own care was rated as low in sensitivity, children were more likely to be insecure when any one of the following three independent conditions obtained. First, the child was in care for more than ten hours a week; second, the child was in low quality care; or third, the child experienced more than one care arrangement.

Before saying anything more about these just described effects of child care on infant-mother attachment security, let me make it clear that the effects I am talking about were by no means overwhelming. In fact, just like the effects of quality of child care on cognitive and social development, they were clearly modest in magnitude. As a result, some are inclined to dismiss the effects. I can understand that inclination but raise the following counter considerations. First, measuring parent-child relationships early in life is a tricky business. Second, even if we accept that the effect is small at the individual level, when summarized across tens of thousands of children in this country experiencing early care, we might be talking about something of major magnitude. Also, worth considering are the limits of the NICHD study. We know that all the people we recruited into the study did not join. We also know that those who dropped out were more psychologically and economically at risk. This raises in my mind that we may have under-sampled the very kids who we found care affecting the most: those growing up with mothers who were providing low sensitive care. If that was the case—I do not know if it was—but if that was the case, that means we may have found that care was adversely affecting more mother-child relationships than the results currently imply.

Even though we cannot resolve this issue, other results from the NICHD study provide further insight. Here I am referring to our results coming from direct observations of mother-child interaction. Not only did we find that the effects of quality of care affected mother-child interaction, but we observed that quantity of care had more pervasive effects. Specifically, the more time kids are in care, the less sensitive mothers were when kids were 6 months of age, the more negative they were when kids were 15 months of age, the

less positively oriented children were to their mothers at 24 and 36 months of age. I must point out again these were not large effects. In fact, they were indisputably small. But I do not think that necessarily means that they are meaningless. First, they were rather consistent with the attachment findings I summarized earlier. Second, they are consistent with results from a study I carried out on my own in State College, Pennsylvania, the home of Penn State University. There I looked not only at mothering but at fathering as well. I did not only observe families when parents and children had nothing else to do but rather in the late afternoon/early evening when parents and children had to go about their everyday household routine. Here I observed, consistent with the NICHD results, that more time in care was related to more negative mothering and less positive fathering.

What are we then to make of these rather similar findings from two different studies? On the one hand, we could dismiss them. First, the effects are not very large. Second, we have already found that when care is of better quality, kids do better. Personally, I find it too easy to minimize these adverse findings for several reasons. One is we know from other data that at older ages kids in early and extensive care of the kind we have look more troubled in certain respects. This raises the possibility, by no means definitively answers the question, that these small effects we are picking up early on in the parent-child relationship may translate to bigger effects in children's functioning later on. We just do not know at this time, and for that reason we are following up these children.

Let me conclude by pointing out the following. I believe it makes sense to be cautious with respect to the adoption of policies that could encourage more and more families to rely upon more and more child care, much of it of questionable quality, at younger and younger ages. In point of fact, I find it especially troubling that some families that choose to rely upon traditional maternal care and thereby forgo the additional income that a second wage earner might provide could find themselves paying taxes to subsidize the nonmaternal care secured by two-wage earner families that make different choices regarding the allocation of a second parent's time and energy.

Although I am certainly in favor of any policy that would substantially increase the quality of care available to the Nation's most needy families, I think it would be a mistake to make minimum improvements in quality while expecting substantial return from investment. If we are going to have to choose between providing substantially better quality of child care for fewer children or only a little bit better quality of care for many, then I think the former strategy makes far more sense, at least if we are increasing quality of care in hopes of enhancing children's development. Ultimately, I would be in favor of a policy in which poor working and even middle class families that have young children get additional tax benefits which could then be used to supplement family income in single wage earner families or to pay for better quality of care in dual wage earner families. Why not consider then substantially increasing during the child's first 2 years of life the $500 per child allowance now available to all families with children under 18, then reduce it somewhat when children are over 2 and under 5,

and then bring it down to the current $500 per child level until the child is 18 years of age? Thank you.

Senator COATS. Thank you, Professor Belsky. We appreciate that very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Belsky follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. JAY BELSKY

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Families, it is indeed an honor and a privilege to be invited here today to testify on the subject of child care. I am Dr. Jay Belsky, Distinguished Professor of Human Development and Family Studies at the Pennsylvania State University. I have conducted research and published numerous articles on child social and emotional development and parent-child relations. I am a recognized scholar of the child-care literature who has read and digested numerous studies conducted by my colleagues around the nation. I am also a child-care researcher myself.

This afternoon I would like to address the effects of early child care on parenting and the parent-child relationship. Toward that end, I plan to share results from two recent investigations, one rather large and the other much more modest in scope. The former is the 10-site, federally funded, NICHD Study of Early Child Care which involves more than 1,300 children and their families who have been followed from birth through age 7. Only results pertaining to the first three years of life will be discussed today, because we have not yet analyzed the data collected beyond this developmental time point. It should be noted that even though all the results of this investigation that I will make reference to have been publically disseminated, the perspective I advance with regard to the findings I will describe may not necessarily represent the views of all collaborating investigators. Thus, this testimony reflects the perspective of only one of the Principal Investigators of this multi-investigator research project. The second study I will make reference to is a much smaller one. It involves some 130 working- and middle-class families raising firstborn sons in central Pennsylvania that I have followed from the time children were 1 year of age to the time they were 6 years of age. Given the primary focus of my remarks today on the topic of parenting, I will restrict my discussion of this investigation to data collected during the child's second and third year of life, a period when extensive home observations of family interaction were conducted.

Before proceeding to summarize findings from these two inquiries regarding parenting and the parent-child relationship, I want to draw attention to the most consistent finding that has emerged from the MCHD Study. Here I am referring to the effect of child care quality. Virtually wherever we have looked, we have found rather consistent, even if modest, effects of quality of care on children's development. Please note that when I speak about quality of care, I am referring to how sensitive, responsive, positively affectionate, and cognitively stimulating the care is that is provided by the child's nonmaternal caregiver. In some cases in our study these caregivers work in child-care centers, whereas in other cases the caregivers are family day-care providers, relatives, or even fathers. This is because in our work we have defined child care as any routine care provided for a minimum of 10 hours per week on a regular basis by someone other than the child's mother.

Results of the MCHD Study disseminated to date consistently indicate that the higher the quality of care that children experience, the better their psychological and behavioral functioning. Thus, we find that children who experience more sensitive, responsive, and stimulating care across their first years of life are cognitively and linguistically better off and are more socially cooperative with adults and age mates. To be noted, though, is that the very findings that highlight such positive effects of child-care quality, simultaneously point to the fact that the lower the quality of care children experience, the poorer their functioning. This latter way of framing the findings seems important to me in light of evidence that the average quality of care in the U.S. is only mediocre in quality. Having drawn attention to this linkage between our results and what should be regarded as the sad state of care in the U.S. it is important to reiterate that the magnitude of the effects we are discerning are by no means large. In some respects, then, questions can—and perhaps should—be raised about the impact that modest improvements in care quality would have on child development. Put more simply, how much bang can we expect from the buck invested in improving child care quality?

Having drawn attention to this critical issue, one that I, for one, will not try to resolve today, I want to turn attention to the topic I was invited to discuss, the effect of early child care on parenting and the parent-child relationship. This is a topic that is near and dear to me because a little more than a decade ago I found myself

in what I came to regard as the "day-care wars", after drawing attention to disconcerting evidence linking early and extensive nonmaternal care—of the kind typically available in the U.S.—to elevated rates of insecure infant-mother attachment relationships. I regarded these findings as important, in part, because of the centrality of the parent-child relationship to children's development. As my mentor, Urie Bronfenbrenner from Cornell University, compellingly argued almost 25 years ago, interventions aimed at affecting the parent-child relationship might be the most important to undertake because this relationship represents an enduring feature of the child's world. Thus, we might expect that planned interventions—or routine experiences like child care—that influence parenting and the parent-child relationship might have enduring effects in ways that other interventions and experiences that did not affect enduring features of the child life would not.

In light of such theory regarding the importance of the parent-child relationship and controversy regarding the effects of early child care on infant-mother attachment security, one major goal of the MCHD Study of Early Child Care was to illuminate the conditions under which routine child care enhanced or undermined children's relationships with their mothers. Thus, not only did we measure the quality of children's nonmaternal care, but we also assessed the amount or quantity of care they experienced, the number of different child-care arrangements they had, and the type of care to which they were exposed. Furthermore, because many of my collaborators had understandable questions about, and even objections to, using the prevailing scientific strategy for assessing one central feature of the mother-child relationship, infant-mother attachment security, we adopted multiple approaches when evaluating the mother-child relationship. Thus, in addition to implementing a laboratory-based separation procedure known as the Strange Situation when children were 15 months of age, we also observed, either in the home or the university laboratory, mother-child interaction when children were 6, 15, 24 and 36 months of age. I think it is important to note in view of some remarks to come, that we adopted these latter approaches at the insistence of some collaborating investigators who argued that if we wanted to know about the mother-child relationship, we should simply observe how mothers and their young children interacted with one another. This would be more revealing, and certainly more ecologically valid, they contended, than trying to interpret emotional and behavioral responses to being separated from mother for a short period of time in the artificial setting of the laboratory.

Two years ago our group reported the first formal results of the MCHD Study, and late last year they were published in the prestigious journal *Child Development*. Although some media reports indicated that no effects of early child care on infant-mother attachment security, as measured in the Strange Situation, were discerned, this was not the case. Even though no feature of child care by itself—be it quantity, quality, stability or type—predicted whether a child would be classified as secure or insecure, there were a number of interesting findings that all pointed in a singular direction which we described as the condition of "dual risk." More specifically, when the quality of mothers' own care was rated as low in sensitivity, children were more likely to be insecure when any one of the following three independent child-care conditions obtained: the child was in care for more than 10 hours per week; the child was in low quality child care; or the child experienced more than 1 care arrangement across the first 15 months of life. There was also some evidence that the risk of insecurity was heightened in the case of boys who experienced more than 30 hours per week of care yet, surprisingly, more risk of insecurity when girls experienced less than 10 hours per week of care (including no care at all).

Before saying anything more about these just-described effects of child care on infant-mother attachment security, let me make it clear that the effects I am talking about were by no means overwhelming. In fact, just like the effects of quality of care on cognitive and social development, they were clearly modest in magnitude. The best way I know of putting this is to say that were any one of us to observe a particular mother-child pair, we could not tell by the naked eye which child had or had not been in care for more than 10 hours per week, or had received poor quality care, or had experienced multiple care arrangements. As a result, some are inclined to dismiss findings of the magnitude we detected. I can understand that inclination, but raise the following counter considerations. First, measuring parent-child relationships, especially in the opening years of life, is a very tricky business and the possibility remains that our ability to detect effects of child care are seriously hampered by limitations of measurement. Second, even if we accept that at the individual level effects of child care—be they positive, negative, or neutral-are small, such effects, when aggregated across tens of thousands of children throughout the United States, may take on special meaning. This would seem especially the case when we recognize that virtually one of every two children under one year of age is cared for by someone other than their mother in America today, a situation dramatically

different from anything we have heretofore experienced. Thus, what may be a small effect at the level of any individual child, may be something quite different from the perspective of our nation. Even though I do not know for sure that this is the case, it is an issue that I believe deserves serious consideration.

Also worth considering in this regard are the limits of NICHD Study, particulary in light of the findings that emerged with regard to attachment security. In designing the study, we purposefully chose to restrict our sampling so as not to include mothers under 18 years of age and non-English speakers. Further, we know that among those families we tried to recruit to participate in our extensive and time-consuming research, a sizeable percentage of families turned us down. Finally, we know that those families that enrolled and then dropped out were more at risk economically and psychologically than those who remained. In sum, I think there are reasonable—but by no means definitive—grounds for wondering whether we may have undersampled the very group of families for whom- we discerned child-care effects, namely, those in which mothers provided care that was rated low in sensitivity relative to the rest of the sample. If this were the case—and remember that this is only a supposition—it raises the possibility that the "dual-risk" pattern of results mentioned above might apply to more children than our results currently imply, and thus that more mother-child relationships might be adversely affected by early child care, at least with regard to infant-mother attachment security as measured in the Strange Situation at 15 months, than some of us have assumed. Alter all, it was the coupling of more than 10 hours per week of care (on average), low quality of care, or more than one care arrangement with low sensitive mothering that increased the rate of insecure attachment.

Needless to say, this remains an issue that I do not think we can resolve. But it is for this very reason that I think it is particularly significant that our group designed into our study other ways of looking at the parent-child relationship. Recall that I noted earlier that because there was disagreement as to the merits of the separation-based, Strange-Situation procedure, we also included in our study design basic observations of mother-child interaction. More specifically, we arranged to observe mothers and their young children repeatedly from age 6-36 months, sometimes videotaping them while they played with a set of toys just as they might do at home on their own, and sometimes observing them while mother responded to questions posed by an interviewer about her child rearing practices. This latter approach captures what I regard as the natural condition of motherhood—having to do more than one thing at a time, in this case, talking with someone while monitoring the child.

I regard it as rather important that we found both positive and negative effects of child care on mother-child interaction. Consistent with the first set of results I quickly summarized, we observed that under conditions of high quality of care, mother-child interaction was more positive. These effects, however, were not as pervasive as those involving amount of care. More specifically, we observed that, irrespective of quality of care, more time in routine nonmaternal care arrangements was associated with less sensitive mothering when the baby was six months of age, more negative mothering when the child was 15 months, less positive engagement of mother by the child at 24 and 36 months, including less affection expressed toward the mother at age 3 years, and less sensitive mothering at 36 months. Once more I have to reiterate that these findings were by no means large; even the term modest exaggerates the magnitude of effect. In point of fact, they were indisputably small. But does that mean meaningless? On this issue I think open mind scientists can disagree. There is a need to highlight the following however: These negative effects of quantity of child care on mother-child interaction are not inconsistent with those pertaining to attachment assessed at age 15 months; are rather consistent across time, indeed interesting in light of the fact that maternal behavior was affected first (at 6 and 15 months) and then only !after (at 24 and 36 months) child behavior; and, finally, ought to be considered at the aggregate societal level as well as at the individual family level.

I find further reason to breathe meaning into these disconcerting findings in view of related ones that derive from that much smaller (and unpublished) study which I carried out in and around the semi-rural university town of State College, PA. where Penn State University is located. Rather the focussing exlcusively upon the mother-child relationship, or placing parent and child in experimentally controlled situations, in this investigation we simply directed parents to go about their everyday household routines at home. We then observed them, typically in the late afternoon and early evening, to gain insight into how mothers and fathers behaved toward their toddlers. Indeed, to insure that we secured reliable measurements, we carried out a total of 8 one-hour observations across the second and third year of life. When I examined these data as a function of child-care experience, I found that

more time in routine nonmaternal care arrangements predicted more negative parenting by mothers and less positive parenting by fathers. Negative parenting, by the way, was defined as expressing negative emotion toward the child and being intrusive and over controlling, whereas positive parenting was defined as being attentive, sensitive, positively affective, and cognitively stimulating. The magnitude of the child-care effects in this study were substantially larger than in the NICHD Study, but again not large on an absolute scale and again not necessarily visible to the naked eye.

What are we to make, then, of two different sets of findings, both highlighting potentially negative effects of child care—as we know it and have it in this country—on the parent-child relationship? On the one hand we could dismiss these findings—for several reasons. First, as I have repeatedly noted, they are by no means large, or even truly modest in magnitude. Second, most of the effects discerned to date on children's functioning outside of the parent-child relationship (e.g., cognitive and linguistic development, social functioning) highlight quality of care, as I noted at the outset, which could suggest that whatever limited negative affect quantity of child care may be having on the mother-child relationship does not pass through to affect the child. Personally, I find it too early to embrace such analysis. No one knows, for example, what will turn up when we examine the data we have collected during the late-preschool years and are in the midst of collecting in the early-elementary-school years in the large NICHD Study. The fact that other research links early, extensive, and continuous child care—of the kind typically available in this country—to negative social and academic functioning at these ages leads me to refrain from explaining away disconcerting results while fully embracing more positive ones regarding the positive effects of high quality care as seems to be going on at times with regard to findings from the NICHD Study.

Ultimately, I find myself relying upon an analogy to highlight the uncertainty of the meaning of our negative effects of child care on mother-child relations in the NICHD Study. To me these results do not suggest that the sky is falling or, for the analogy with which I will conclude, that it is pouring outside. Rather, it seems to me that we are faced with the kind of situation one encounters when stepping out of the house in the morning having not heard the weather report only to find out that it is drizzling. What we cannot determine in such a situation is whether the clouds will clear and the sun will come out, in which case there is probably no need to go back inside to get an umbrella, whether the drizzle will turn into a steady, day-long downpour necessitating an umbrella, or whether the drizzle will simply continue all day long. In other words, we cannot tell at the current time whether the very modest negative effects I believe we have detected with regard to the parent-child relationship will disappear, grow larger, or remain at the same level as children and their relationships with their parents develop. It is for this reason that, as developmental researchers, we continue to follow the children we are are studying.

I believe that for this reason it also makes sense to be cautious with respect to the adoption of public policies that will encourage more and more families to rely upon more and more child care—much of it of questionable quality—at younger and younger ages. Indeed, I find it especially troubling that some families that choose to rely upon traditional maternal care and thereby forego the additional income that a second wage-earner might provide may find themselves paying taxes to subsidize the nonmaternal care secured by two-wage earner families that make different choices regarding the allocation of a second parent's time and energy. Although I am certainly in favor of any policy that would substantially increase the quality of child care available to the nation's most needy families, I think it is a mistake to make minimum improvements, if any, in quality, and expect substantial returns from such investment. If we are going to have to choose between providing substantially better quality of child care to fewer children or only a little bit better quality of care to many, then I think the former strategy makes far more sense, at least if we are increasing quality of care in hopes of enhancing children's development. Ultimately, I would recommend a policy in which poor, working, and middle-class families that have young children get additional tax benefits which could then be used to supplement family income in single-wage earner homes or pay for better quality care in dual-wage earner families. Why not consider, then, substantially increasing the $500 per child allowance now available to all families during the child's first year or two, then reduce it somewhat for children under five, and then have it remain $500 per child for children older than five?

Senator COATS. Our fourth presenter and then we will turn to our respondents and involve all of us in this discussion is Dr. Armand Nicholi, Jr. Dr. Nicholi is Associate Clinical Professor of Psy-

chiatry at Harvard Medical School and the Massachusetts General Hospital. Dr. Nicholi's research has focused on study of changes in the structure of the American family and their impact on the psychological development of children. In the past, he served as a consultant to the U.S. Peace Corps, to the United States Surgeon General, to the White House and to several members of Congress. Dr. Nicholi, we appreciate your being here with us and look forward to your presentation.

Dr. NICHOLI. I would like to share just a few observations on families and children that I think underscore what has been presented thus far. These observations address the first question, what is best for children, and perhaps my comments relate more to a more specific aspect of that question, what is best for the healthy emotional development of children?

My observations stem from about 35 years of clinical experience, from my own research, and from the research of other investigators reported in the medical literature. The medical literature reveals a vast body of data exploring the impact of absent parents on the emotional development of children. Beginning with the classic research of Dorothy Burlingham and Anna Freud on children separated from their parents during the Second World War, over 50 years ago, and repeated by thousands of carefully controlled studies since that time, we now, I think, have a rather clear idea what is best for the emotional well-being of children.

I have included with copies of my remarks a far from inclusive list of relevant research of the past 10 years and, to demonstrate how long we have had access to this data, a shorter list of reports extending back some 50 years.

What does this vast body of clinical research tell us about what is best for children? These findings indicate with unmistakable clarity that the emotional well-being of a child rests heavily on a close, warm, and sustained relationship with both parents, and conversely the absence of a parent through death, divorce, sickness, or time demanding job subjects that child to high risk for certain emotional illnesses, illnesses that may occur early or later in life. This research, like so much research on human behavior, states the obvious. It is obvious once you become aware of it. Yet the obvious is most often overlooked and most often neglected. The studies confirm that child care relegated to agencies outside the home regardless of the quality of those facilities and regardless of the training of the staff can never substitute for the care of a parent who loves the child more than anything else on earth. And consequently, the most important step a nation can take to do what is best for children is to ensure that its institutions and organizations unite in an attempt to provide maximum time for parents to spend with their children and with one another. This involves an extraordinarily difficult task that must consider, of course, the economic realities as well as the psychological needs of both the parents and the children.

In our particular society, we fail to meet one another's emotional needs because we are essentially absent from one another, from our spouse and especially from our children. We use the cliche it is the quality and not the quantity of time that counts. We hear that all of the time, but time and emotional accessibility are like the oxy-

gen that we breathe. Although the quality of the oxygen is important, the quantity determines whether we live or die.

My first interest in the impact of absent parents on the emotional development of children came from my early clinical experience as a psychiatrist to the students and faculty at Harvard. At that time, about 60 to 70 percent of the study body came from private schools, the opposite of what it is now. In my clinical work, I began to see students from privileged backgrounds who presented with a specific cluster of symptoms: low self-esteem and feelings of worthlessness, inability to establish close trusting relationships, inability to get their work done and feeling out of sorts with themselves and with the world generally, and anger bordering on rage close to the surface and directed often toward the parents and toward other authority.

Did I say something that set off that alarm? [Laughter.] What these students had in common was that their care as infants and young children had been relegated to babysitters and nannies. They had little physical or emotional contact with their parents. Most had been sent to boarding school at an early age, an experience many considered rejection. During these years, I also worked evenings in a clinic for the poor from the inner city, and much to my surprise I noticed the same cluster of symptoms among the adolescents and young adults. Like the more privileged Harvard students, these patients from poor families also had very little contact with their parents. The father had usually disappeared and the mother was out working long hours to survive. Infant and child care was relegated to whomever was available.

Though they shared a common background of inaccessible parents and the same symptoms as young adults, I observed one difference: those from wealthy backgrounds tended to turn their anger inward, becoming depressed, and expressing their anger in self-destructive behavior—heavy drinking, psychoactive drugs, sexual acting out, and so forth. Those from poor backgrounds turned their rage outward into violent crime and other antisocial behavior.

My real interest in the impact of parental absence on emotional development began while conducting research on college students. During the early years of my clinical experience, I began a study of several young men who dropped out of Harvard for emotional reasons. Two characteristics of that group were, one, a marked isolation and alienation from their parents, especially their fathers, and, two, an overwhelming apathy and lack of motivation. In addition, among those who had the most serious emotional illnesses, severe depression or schizophrenia, a large number lost one or both parents through death. When compared with several control groups, this finding proved highly significant statistically.

As I continued my research, I realized that the death of a parent early in life was only one kind of absence. A study I conducted at that time on children in Boston suburb indicated that children who lost a parent through divorce appeared to suffer even greater consequences than losing a parent through death. We found a statistically significant, strikingly higher incidence of emotional illness among these children than children from intact families.

As you see from the list of recent research on the family, many studies over the past 10 years focus on separation of parents as a

result of divorce. The divorce rate has risen over 700 percent in this century, most of this rise occurring during the 1970's and the 1980's. The short-term and long-term effects of divorce first explored some 15 to 20 years ago have now been replicated by hundreds of studies. Again, I refer you to the list of references attached to my comments.

When we consult the scientific and the medical literature, we find an impressive body of data based on carefully controlled experiments that corroborate the impression that a parent's absence through death, through divorce or through a time-demanding job can exert a profound influence on a child's emotional health. The magnitude of this research paints an unmistakenly clear picture of the adverse effects of parental absence and emotional inaccessibility.

Why has our society almost totally ignored this research? The answer is the same reason society ignored for scores of years sound research on the adverse effects of cigarette smoke. The facts demand a change in our lifestyle that we simply do not want to change or that we have great difficulty changing. Because families provide the foundation of our lives as individuals as well as the vital cells of our society, we can no longer afford to ignore this research.

Let me close with a couple of suggestions. I recommend that one way to meet the need of children for parental accessibility is for our institutions and organizations, our State and Federal Governments, our school and universities, our corporations, for our organizations to unite in giving the family the highest priority, that working hours within these organizations be geared to husbands and wives spending a sufficient amount of every 24 hours with one another and with their children. Would it be possible for Congress to set a model in this regard for the rest of the nation?

Second, that our institutions and organizations encourage mothers with young children to work at home whenever possible, abolishing outdated laws that discourage this work, that conferences and conventions stop taking spouses away from the family for days or weeks but include families, that employers permit individuals to refuse to be moved to another location so as not to uproot the family without fearing a demotion.

And, three, I would like to recommend that young mothers who must work be provided facilities for superb care of their children, time to visit them during the day, and flexible hours to allow them to be home when their older children return from school. Thank you.

Senator COATS. Dr. Nicholi, thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Nicholi follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ARMAND M. NICHOLI, JR., MD

I would like to share a few observations on families and children. These observations address the first question raised by this hearing—"what is best for children?" Perhaps my comments relate to a more specific aspect of that question, namely—"what is best for the healthy, emotional development of children?"

My observations derive from 35 years of clinical experience, from my research, and the research of other investigators reported in the medical literature.

The medical literature reveals a vast body of data exploring the impact of absent parents on the emotional development of children. Beginning with the classic research of Dorothy Burlingham and Anna Freud on children separated from their

parents during World War II over 50 years ago and repeated by thousands of carefully controlled studies since that time, we now have a rather clear idea of what is best for the emotional well-being of children.

(I have included with copies of my remarks, a far from inclusive list of relevant research of the past 10 years, and, to demonstrate how long we have had access to this data, a shorter list of reports extending back some 50 years.)

What does this vast body of clinical research tell us about what is best for children? These findings indicate with unmistakable clarity that the emotional well-being of a child rests heavily on a close, warm and sustained relationship with both parents; and conversely, the absence of a parent through death, divorce, sickness or time-demanding jobs subjects that child to high risk for certain emotional illnesses—illnesses that may occur early or later in life.

This research, like so much research on human behavior states the obvious—once you become aware of it. Yet the obvious is most often overlooked and neglected. The studies confirm that child care relegated to agencies outside the home, regardless of the quality of the facilities and the training of the staff, can never substitute for the care of a parent who loves the child more than anything else on earth. And consequently, the most important step a nation can take to do "what is best for children" is to insure that its institutions and organizations unite in an attempt to provide maximum time for parents to spend with their children and with one another. This involves an extraordinarily difficult task that must consider the economic realties and the specific psychological needs of both the parents and children.

In our particular society, we fail to meet one another's emotional needs because we are essentially absent from one another—from our spouse, and especially from our children. We use the cliche—"It's the quality and not the quantity of time that counts." But time and emotional accessibility are like the oxygen we breathe. Although the quality of the oxygen is important, the quantity determines whether we live or die.

My first interest in the impact of absent parents on the emotional development of children came from my early clinical experience as a psychiatrist to the students and faculty at Harvard. At that time about 60 to 70 percent of the student body came from private schools—the opposite of what it is now. In my clinical work, I began to see students from privileged backgrounds who presented with a specific cluster of symptoms:

—Low self esteem and feelings of worthlessness

—Inability to establish close, trusting relationships

—Inability to get their work done and feeling out of sorts with themselves and with the world generally

—Anger bordering on rage close to the surface and directed often toward the parents and toward other authority.

What these students had in common was that their care as infants and young children had been relegated to baby sitters and nannies. They had little physical or emotional contact with their parents. Most had been sent to boarding school at an early age—an experience many considered rejection.

During these years I also worked evenings in a clinic for the poor from the inner city. And, much to my surprise, I noticed the same cluster of symptoms among the adolescents and young adults. Like the more privileged Harvard students, these patients from poor families also had very little contact with their parents. The father had usually disappeared and the mother was out working long hours to survive. Infant and child care was relegated to whomever was available.

Though they shared a common background of inaccessible parents and the same symptoms as young adults, I observed one difference: those from wealthy backgrounds tended to turn their anger inward, becoming depressed and expressing their anger in self-destructive behavior—heavy drinking, psychoactive drugs, sexual acting out, etc. Those from poor backgrounds turned their rage outward into violent crime and other anti social behavior.

My real interest in the impact of parental absence on emotional development began while conducting research on college students. During the early years of my clinical experience, I began a study of several hundred young men who dropped out of Harvard for psychiatric reasons. Two characteristics of that group were: (1) a marked isolation and alienation from their parents, especially their fathers, and (2) an overwhelming apathy and lack of motivation. In addition, among those who had the most serious emotional illnesses, severe depression or schizophrenia, a large number lost one or both parents through death. When compared with several control groups, this finding proved highly significant statistically.

As I continued my research, I realized that the death of a parent early in life was only one kind of absence. A study I conducted at that time on school children in a Boston suburb indicated that children who lost a parent through divorce appeared

to suffer even greater consequences than losing a parent through death. We found a statistically significant, strikingly higher incidence of emotional illness among these children than children from intact families.

As you see from the list of recent research on the family, many studies over the 10 years focus on separation of parents as a result of divorce. The divorce rate has risen over 700 percent in this century, most of this rise occurring during the 1970's and 1980's. The short term and long term effects of divorce, first explored some fifteen to twenty years ago, have now been replicated by hundreds of studies. Again I refer you to the list of references attached to my comments.

When we consult the scientific and medical literature, we find an impressive body of data based on carefully controlled experiments that corroborate the impression that a parent's absence through death, divorce or time-demanding job can exert a profound influence on a child's emotional health. The magnitude of this research paints an unmistakably clear picture of the adverse effects of parental absence and emotional inaccessibility.

Why has our society almost totally ignored this research? The answer is the same reason society ignored for scores of years sound data on the adverse effects of cigarette smoke. The facts demand a change in our lifestyle that we simply do not want to change—or that we have difficulty changing. Because families provide the foundation of our lives as individuals as well as the vital cells of our society, we can no longer afford to ignore this research.

Let me close with a couple of suggestions.

I recommend that:

1). One way to meet the need of children for parental accessibility is for our institutions and organizations—our state and federal government, our schools and universities, our corporations—to unite in giving the family the highest priority; that working hours within these organizations be geared to husbands and wives spending a sufficient amount of every 24 hours with one another and their children. (Would it be possible for Congress to set a model for the rest of the nation?).

2). That our institutions and organizations encourage mothers with young children to work at home whenever possible, abolishing outdated laws that discourage this work. That conferences and conventions stop taking spouses away from the family for days or weeks, but include families. That employers permit individuals to refuse to be moved to another location so as not to uproot the family, without fearing a demotion.

3). That young mothers who must work be provided facilities for superb care of their children, time to visit them during the day and flexible hours to allow them to be home when their older children return from school.

The Impact of Absent Parents on the Emotional Development of Children: Relevant Research During the Past 10 Years

Relevant Research During the Past 10 Years

Patten SB. The loss of a parent during childhood as a risk factor for depression. Can J Psychiatry 1991 Dec;36(10):706-711.

Tweed JL, Schoenbach JF, George LK, Blazer DG. The effects of parental death and divorce on six-month history of anxiety disorders. Br J Psychiatry 1989 June;154:823-828.

Zahner GE, Murphy JM. 1-055 in childhood: anxiety in adulthood. Compr Psychiatry 1989 Nov;30(6): 553-563.

Tousignallt M, Bastien MF, Hamel S. Suicidal attempts and ideations among adolescents and young adults: the contribution of the father's and mother's care and of parental separation. Soc Psychiatry Epidemiol 1993 Oct;28(5):256-261.

Rapheal B, Cubis J, Dunne M, Lewin T, Kelly B. The impact of parental loss on adolescents' psychosocial characteristics. Adolescence 1990;25(99):689-700.

Mason CA, Cauce AM, Gonzales N, Hiraga Y. Adolescent problem behavior: the effect of peers and the moderating role of father absence and the mother-child relationship. Am J Community Psychol 1994 Dec;22(6):723-743.

Kelley ML. The effects of military-induced separation of family factors and child behavior. Am J Orthopsychiatry 1994 Jan;64(1):103-111.

Oakley Browne MA, Joyce PR, Wells JE, Bushnell JA, Hornblow AR. Disruptions in childhood parental care as risk factors for major depression in an adult woman. Aust N Z J Psychiatry 1995 Sep;29(3):437-446.

Jensen PS, Martin D, Watanabe H. Children's response to parental separation during operation desert storm. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry 1996 Apr;35(4):433-441.

Wallerstein JS, CorbiN SB. Daughters of divorce: report from a ten-year follow-up. Am J Orthopsychiatry 1989 Oct;59(4):593-604.

Kuh D, Maclean M. Women's childhood experience of parental separation and their subsequent health and socioeconomic status in adulthood. J Biosoc Sci 1990Jan;22(1):121-135.

Johnston SC, Thomas AM. Divorce versus intact parental marriage and perceived risk and dyadic trust in present heterosexual relationships. Psychol Rep 1996 Apr;78(2):387-390.

Wadsworth M, Maclean M, Duth D, Rodgers B. Children of divorced and separated parents: summary and review of findings from a long-term follow-up study in the UK. Fam Pract 1990 June;7(2):100-109.

Mcleod, JD. Childhood parental loss and adult depression. J Health Soc Behav 1991 Sept;32(3):205-220.

lLanderman, R, George LK, Blazer DG. Adult vulnerability for psyciatric disorders: interactive effects of negative childhood experiences and recent stress. J Nerv Ment Dis 1991 Nov;179(11):656-663.

Wallerstein JS. The long term effects of divorce on children: a review. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry 1991 May;30(3):349-360.

Wallerstein JS, Resnikoff D. Parental divorce and developmental progression: an inquiry into their relationship. Int J Psychoanal 1997 Feb;78(Pt 1):135-154.

Gelles, RJ. Child abuse and violence in single-parent families: parent absence and economic deprivation. Am. J Orthopsychiatry 1989 Oct;59(4) 492-501.

Benjaminsen S. Krarup G. Lauritsen R. Personality, parental rearing behaviour and parental loss in attempted suicide: a comparative study. Acta Psychiatr Scand 1990 Nov;82(5):369-397.

Runeson R. Psychoactive substance use disorder in youth suicide. Alcohol 1990;25(5):561-568.

Ludolph PS. Westen D, Misle B, Jackson A, Wixon J, Wiss FC. The borderline diagnosis in adolescents: symptoms and developmental history. Am J Psychiatry 1990 Apr;147(4):470-476.

Stoker A, Swadi H. Perceived family relationships in drug abusing adolescents. Drug Alcohol Depend 1990 June;25(3):293-297.

Forehand R. Wierson M. Thomas AM, Fauber R, Armistead I. Kempton T, Long N. A short-term longitudinal examination of young adolescennt functioning following divorce: the role of family factors. J Abnorm Child Psychol 1991 Feb;19(1):97-111.

Spigelman G, Spigelman A, Englesson I. Hostility, aggression and anxiety levels of divorc and nondivorce children as manifested in their responses to projective tests. J Pers Assess 1991 June;56(3):438-452.

Neighbors B, Forehand R, Armistead L. Is parental divorce a critical stressor for young adolescents? Grade point average as a case in point. Adolescence 1992;27(107):639-646.

Aro HM, Palosarri UK. Parental divorce, adolescence, and transition to young adulthood: a follow up study. Am J Orthopsyhiatry 1992 July;62(3):421-429.

Barber BL, Eccles JS. Long-term influence of divorce and single parenting on adolescent family-and work-related values, behaviors, aspirations. Psychol Bull 1992 Jan;111(1):108-126.

Botsis AJ, Plutchik R, Kotler M, van Prang HM. Parental loss and family violence as correlates of suicide and violence risk. Suicide Life Threat. Behav 1995;25(2);253-260.

Wagner BM. Family risk factors for child and adolescent suicidal behavior. Psychol Bull 1997 Mar;121(2):246-298.

Gabel S. Behavioral problems in sons of incarcerated or otherwise absent fathers: the issue of separation. Fam Process 1992 Sep;31(3):303-314.

Brubeck D. Beer J. Depression, self-esteem, suicide ideation, death anxiety, and GPA in high school students of divorced and nondivorced parents. Psychol Rep 1992 Dec;17(3Pt. 1):755-763.

Billingham RE, Post J, Gross WC. Parental divorce and the change in drinking behavior from high school to college. Psychol Rep 1993 Jun;72(3 Pt. 2):1275-1281.

Lamminpaa A. Alcohol intoxication in childhood and adolescence. Alcohol Alcohol 1995 Jan;30(1):5-12.

Fergusson DM, Horwood LJ, Lynskey MT. Parental separation, adolescent psychopathology, and problem behaviors. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry 1994 Oct;33(8):1122-1131.

Lebrun E, Bost M. Children in parental separation. Review of the literature. Arch Pediatr 1994 Mar;1(3):289-296.

Schwartzberg AZ. The impact of divorce on adolescents. Hosp Community Psychiatry 1992 Jun;43(6):634-637.

Bolger R, Zweig-Frank H, Paris J. Childhood antecedents of interpersonal problems in young adult children of divorce. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry 1995 Feb;34(2):143-150.

46-900 98 - 2

Forehand R, Armistead L, David C. Is adolescent adjustment following parental divorce a function of predivorce adjustment? J Abnorm Child Psychol 1994 Apr;25(2):187-164.

Leenaars AA, Lester D. The changing suicide pattern in Canadian adolescents and youth, compared to their American counterparts. Adolescence 1995;30(119):539-547.

Noyes R Jr, Clancy J, Woodrman C, Holt CS, Suelzer M, Christiansen J, Anderson DJ. Environmental factors related to the outcome of panic disorder. A seven-year follow-up study. J Nerv Ment Dis 1993 Sep;181(9): 529-538.

Schwartz JE, Friedman HS, Tucker JS, Tomlinson-Keasey C, Wingard DL, Criqui MH. Sociodemographic and psychosocial factors in childhood as predictors of adult mortality. Am J Public Health 1995 Sep;85(9):1237-1245.

Krause N. Early parental loss and personal control in later life. J Gerontol 1993 May;48(3):P117-P126.

THE IMPACT OF ABSENT PARENTS ON THE EMOTIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN: SELECTED EARLY RESEARCH

Bender, L. and Yarnell, H. "An Observation Nursery: A Study of 250 Children on the Psychiatric Division of Bellevue Hospital," Amer. J. Psychiat., 1941, 97:1158-72.

Bowlby, J. "The Influence of Early Environment in the Development of Neurosis and Neurotic Character," Int. J. Psycho-Anal., 1940, 21:154-78.

Bowlby, J. Maternal Care and Mental Health. Geneva: WHO; London: HMSO; New York: Columbia University Press, 1951. Abridged version, Child care and the Growth of Love, 1965. Harmondsworth, Middx: Penguin Books, second edition.

Bronfenbrenner, U. "The Origins of Alienation," Scientific American, 1974, 231:53-59.

Burlingham, D.T. and Freud, A. Young Children in War-Time: A Year's Work in a Residential War Nursery. London: Allen & Unwin, 1942.

Burlingham, D.T. and Freud, A. Infants Without Families: The Case For and Against Residential Nurseries. London: Allen & Unwin, 1943.

Goldfarb, W. "Infant Rearing and Problem Behavior," Amer. J. Orthopsychiat., 1943, 13:249-65.

Heinicke, C. "Some Effects of Separating Two-Year-Old Children From Their Parents: A Comparative Study," Hum. Relat., 1956, 9:105-76.

Heinicke, C. and Westheimer, I. Brief Separations. New York: International Universities Press; London: Longmans, 1966.

Jellinek, M. and Slovik, L. "Divorce: Impact on Children", N. Engl. J. Med., 1981 557-559.

Levy, D. "Primary Affect Hunger," Amer J. Psychiat., 1937, 94:643-52. "Observations of Attitudes and Behavior in the Child Health Center," Amer. J. Publ. Hlth., 1951, 41:182-90.

Nicholi, A.M., Jr. "Harvard Dropouts: Some Psychiatric findings, Am J Psychiatry, 1967, 124:651-8.

Nicholi, A.M., Jr. and Watt, N.F. "Death of a Parent in the Etiology of Schizophrenia." In Scientific Proceedings of the 129th Annual Meeting of the American Psychiatric Association. Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Association, 1976, pp. 116-117.

Nicholi, A.M., Jr. Children and The Family. Report of the Massachusetts Governors Advisory Committee, 1980.

Nicholi, A.M., Jr. "American Youth—And The Families That Raise Them." In Fighting for the Family. K. Perotta and J.C. Blattner (Eds.) 1990, Pastoral Renewal, Ann Arbor, MI.

Nicholi, A.M., Jr. "The Impact of Family Dissolution on the Emotional Health of Children and Adolescents." In When Families Fail. B.C. Christenson, Ed., University Press of America, New York, London, 1991.

Rekers, G.A., Mead, S.L., Rosen, A.C. and Brigham, S.L., "Family Correlates of Male Childhood Gender Disturbance, Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1983, 142:31-42.

Rekers, G.A. "Father Absence in Broken Family: The Effects of Children's Development," Oversight on the Breakdown of the Traditional Family Unit. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983, pp. 131-175.

Robertson, J. and BoWlby, J. "Responses of Young Children to Separation From their Mothers," Courr. Cent. Int. Enf., 1952, 2:131-42.

Small, G.S. and Nicholi, A.M., Jr. "Mass Hysteria Among School Children: Early Loss as a Predisposing Factor," Arch. Gen. Psychiatry, 1982, 39:721-724.

Spitz, R.A. "Anaclitic Depression," Psychoanal. Study, 1946, 2:313-42.

Toward a National Policy for Children and Families (Chapters 2, 6). Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1976.
Trunnell, T.L. "The Absent Father's Children's Emotional Disturbances." Arch. Gen. Psychiatry, 1968, 19:180-8.
U.S. Bureau of the Census, Social Indicators. 1976. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, 1977.
Wallerstein, J. "The Impact of Divorce on Children." Psychiatric Clin. North Am., 1900, 3:455-468.
Wallerstein, J. "Children After Divorce: Wounds That Don't Heal." The Psychiatric Times, Aug. 1989, pp. 8-11.
Zwerling, I. "Struggle for Survival." In The American Family (Unit 1, Report #4). Smith, Kline and French Laboratories, 1978, page 8.

Senator COATS. For the record, we are joined by Senator Gregg from New Hampshire, which we very much appreciate and whose magnetic personality apparently tripped the security system on the way in. [Laughter.] But we are happy that you are here. And we thank our four presenters for, I think, opening this discussion with some very informative and some very provocative information that will provide the basis for the discussion that is about to take place.

Let me introduce our discussants. I am not sure that is a word, but it is written on my notes here. [Laughter.] We are going to look that up in Webster's when I get done, but our discussants are Assistant Secretary Olivia Golden, who is Assistant Secretary for Children and Families at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and in this capacity, Assistant Secretary Golden oversees the agency responsible for over 60 Federal programs that serve children and their families. Before joining the administration, Ms. Golden was Director of Programs and Policies for the Children's Defense Fund. Pleased to have you here with us.

Maggie Gallagher is an affiliate scholar at the Institute for American Values, a mother, author of two books. She has a nationally syndicated column which is carried in over 80 papers nationwide and has worked as an editor of National Review and one of the founding editors of the Manhattan Institute's City Journal. Maggie, we are pleased to have you.

Helen Blank is Director of Child Care at the Children's Defense Fund. In this capacity, Helen works to promote Federal, State, local and private sector policies which seek to ensure that families are able to choose quality child care that meets their needs.

Wade Horn is President of the National Fatherhood Initiative which is a mission to improve the well-being of children by increasing the number of children growing up with involved, committed and responsible fathers. From 1989 to 1993, Mr. Horn was Commissioner for Children, Youth and Families and Chief of the Children's Bureau with the United States Department of Health and Human Services. He also served as a presidential appointee to the National Commission on Children.

And finally, and certainly not last in any sense of the word, Dr. Brenda Hunter, a psychologist and internationally published author, having written numerous books on mothering and child development including the soon to be released The Power of Mother Love. At the newsstands when, Brenda?

Ms. Hunter. Two weeks.

Senator COATS. In 2 weeks. So look for that. Brenda Hunter, Dr. Hunter, is a former therapist, and she has co-founded a national advocacy group for mothers. We are pleased that each of these dis-

tinguished individuals can be with us to respond and to initiate discussion, and I want to also ask our presenters to engage in this. Questions back and forth are more than appropriate. And my colleagues feel free to participate in this discussion.

Let me start. I have a number of questions, but I do not want to start off here. I will just throw those in if necessary. Let me start by asking any or all of our discussants to respond to what they have heard, to throw out questions or points that they would like to make and, doctor, you are more than welcome to start out.

Ms. Golden. Thank you. It is a real honor to be here to be able to listen and to be able to comment on this topic. I guess I wanted to make three points very briefly that emerged as I was thinking about the comments of the distinguished panel. The first is a point that both Dr. Belsky and Dr. Greenspan made, and I just want to underline it because I think it is extraordinarily important. And that is that we now really do, I think, have a research consensus that the quality of child care matters to children's development and that we know something about what quality is and what it looks like.

I do worry certainly that where there is low quality care and especially—and this is Dr. Belsky's dual risk point—where there are also difficult family situations and infants who begin care very early, that could have a bad impact on children. That is exactly why it is so critical to the administration's proposal to, in fact, focus on quality. And I just want to highlight, on Thursday, I had the chance to testify at a field hearing that Congressman Shays of Connecticut conducted with bipartisan membership of his committee there and Dr. Ed Zigler on the panel with me to talk about what the research says about very young children, and again that consensus that we know what quality is and we need to move on it so that we can do something effective for young children came through both in the statements from the Republican and Democratic members and from the experts. And I just think that is a really important thing.

The second point that I wanted to make very briefly that I think came through in the background in some of the presentations, but I just want to underline it, is that good and affordable child care choices are essential for the millions of low income working families who have to work to support their families, their children. I have been traveling a lot. I actually had the chance to be in the great State of New Hampshire on Friday and spoke to a family there. I have not yet been in Vermont to talk to parents, and I guess what I want to highlight is that when I talk to parents who are working in nursing home jobs, in factories, as secretaries, in a sandwich shop, what I hear from them is that they do not want to leave their jobs for welfare. The lady that I talked to in New Hampshire was newly a working mother. She left welfare 3 months ago and she did not want to go back. But at the same time, having child care that is good for children is, I think, central to those parents, and our responsibility, I think, as the President highlighted in the State of the Union is to support those parents so they have decent choices, so they are not forced to choose between a job that they desperately need and a child they love.

The third point, just to make it very briefly, is that I also think that the President believes strongly that we should respect and support parents in whatever choices they make. That is the reason for his strong record in supporting such provisions as the $500 per child tax credit, which was mentioned, the EITC, increases in the minimum wage, family and medical leave, and I guess from my perspective, the parents I talk to really often it is hard to talk about an either/or of working or at home. People move between full-time work, part-time work, the ability to be home for a period of time, depending on a wide range of things in their family circumstances.

So for me the critical point, and I think several of the panelists made it, is that we need to have quality child care available for parents who need to work because we now know so much about what that care can mean for children if it is good and about the risks if it is not good.

Senator COATS. Let me ask if any of our presenters want to respond to that? Dr. Greenspan?

Dr. GREENSPAN. Yes. I would just like to respond that I think the interesting debate, if there is a debate, and I hope there is not one, is what quality means, what constitutes high quality care? I think those of us who spoke already—I was pleased to see this—we had not known what anyone else was going to say—pretty much had an agreement on one of the critical elements of quality for children in their first 3 years of life, and that was a consistent loving caregiver, preferably the biological mother or father if they are available and can provide that care. Now that is a very, very important qualifier. If we come out and say that when the mommy and daddy are able to provide that care and provide high quality care, they can provide consistency over time, and they can provide a quality of love that is not available from somebody who is hired, we need to support that in variety of ways. If we can use that as part of our definition of quality, I think that we would go a long way to having a consensus on a very, very healthy child care initiative in this country.

Senator COATS. Let me ask our other respondents here if there is a point they would like to make?

Ms. Gallagher. Yes. I think that there is one issue which we have not defined very well in this debate. I would be interested in hearing some comments on it. And that is when we talk about the child care system, are we talking about the commercial child care system or are we talking about the child care system as a whole? I think that there is a great danger when you talk about the need for more child care of creating a system. The system we have now is already—we have substantial benefits that are available only if you choose commercial paid child care. And if you take a system where you take more children out of families and get them into commercial child care, that comes up as having increased the system's child care capacity, but I wonder if, in fact, what we simply have not done is move child care out of the family and into the marketplace.

In particular, I am wondering if we could have a consensus here that for the well-being of children, it is important that any benefits that are available for child care be available regardless of the form

of child care that a family chooses. We are not just talking about stay-at-home mothers or stay-at-home fathers, but we are talking about the fact that fully half of working mothers are not in the market for child care at all. They are either finding a way to make money while they care for their children, while their husbands care for their children or they have another relative, and it seems to me that there is a great danger in having the government in its inflexibility take what is happening now, which is there is a revolution among women about the meaning and structure of work, and structuring benefits sort of along the lines of an old-fashioned male model where you essential hire a substitute caregiver to be your wife and then you work like a man, and perhaps the Assistant Secretary or some of the other experts here could comment on the dangers of defining child care as commercial child care.

Ms. GOLDEN. I could certainly offer the facts which I know the members of this committee know well because the committee was involved in the bipartisan development of the child care and development block grant. The approaches to subsidizing the care of low-income parents that exists now are focused on the parent's choice and so parents have the opportunity to purchase care from a relative, with a neighbor, in a family home, in a center. The rough numbers are about half and half, choosing care in a center, but it was very important as that strategy was developed to ensure that parents could have a range of choices, and I do think——

Ms. GALLAGHER. But if a low-income couple tag teamed—if the husband went so far as to be caring for the children while the wife worked, they would not be available for these benefits; is that correct? Am I correct in that?

Ms. GOLDEN. Those families that do not need to pay for care are able to maintain their jobs without the subsidy. The subsidy is there for families who need to pay for care, and often families find, and this is again one of the issues, I think, as families move from welfare to work, that arrangements with relatives that are unpaid do not tend to last as well and provide the continuity that Dr. Belsky and Dr. Greenspan highlighted. But I do think that the key issue is for parents to have the choices for their children.

Mr. HORN. May I just ask for a clarification because I am confused on one point? If you have a two-parent married household and they are both working at minimum wage, by every measure we would say this is a low-income family; is that correct? So if they rather than choosing an out-of-the-home child care arrangement struggle to put together a situation where the father works during the day and the mother works at night and on weekends, would they or would they not be available for child care subsidies?

Ms. GOLDEN. That family would have a variety of other supports to their income that are obviously a critical part of the administration's commitment to low-income families. But both the child care subsidies and the child care tax credit focus on reimbursement for paying for child care. An example of the family that would be eligible for the tax credit I heard from the employee services director in a major hotel chain where she talked about a family of a janitor married to a housekeeper, the kind of income level that you are describing, and a family that was struggling with care for two children and an ill elderly parent and were desperate, and again ena-

bling them to have some financial assistance was going to be critical to their keeping their jobs.

Mr. HORN. Isn't the answer to my question no?

Ms. GOLDEN. The answer is they will have other supports but not child care——

Mr. HORN. Aren't those other supports also available to those who pick out-of-home care?

Ms. GOLDEN. Yes, the other supports are about family income and making the choices possible.

Ms. GALLAGHER. But it is not income sensitive. If you have a family that makes 30,000 or $25,000 a year, and they choose to forego—the enormous sacrifice of having a two full-time working parents, that is an enormous cost, which the proposals as they now stand do not acknowledge. They do not help the family make that choice at all, whereas if you make the choice to pay, the key differential is that you have to pay money in the market for child care, and any other struggle or sacrifice you make is not under the current terms of the debate being acknowledged or encouraged or put on an equal footing. And I guess the question I would have is unless your goal is to say it is better for kids to be in commercial child care as opposed to family child care, why would you not structure benefits so that they are available to all families, to help all families who are struggling with this?

If you want to help only low-income families, then make the cutoff the income of the family and not if you choose not to be in the commercial child care market you are not worthy of our attention and apparently you can get along without any help. It seems to me that if you structure benefits so that you must use commercial child care in order to get them, you are essentially sending a strong signal from Washington that this is the preferable way of raising children and you are disadvantaging the sacrifices that families are making and it is large sacrifices. The average income of a family that has a stay-at-home mother is about $20,000 a year less than the median income of the two-earner family. $35,000 a year is the median income of the one-earner married household. These are not luxurious families. These are families struggling to provide the best for their children, and it seems to me that many will find it insulting, and new mothers who are struggling to put together a package will be getting a strong signal that this is not a good choice or at least Washington does not think so.

Ms. GOLDEN. I should just note one other fact that may be useful in thinking about this which is that the commitments that the President has made to the incomes of all low-income families and to supporting their choices, in particular the Earned Income Tax Credit and the $500 per child credit, are worth about $250 billion over the next 5 years. So I do think that the theme that I think we all agree on is a commitment to support family choices for low-income families in a variety of ways.

Senator COATS. I am going to acknowledge the presence of Senator Wellstone from Minnesota who has joined us and been an active member. I think earlier I said Health and Human Resources Committee. We are trying to gather all the jurisdiction we can on health care. Maybe that was a freudian slip or something. But the

Labor and Human Resources Committee. Senator Wellstone, we welcome you, and I heard you——

Senator WELLSTONE. Mumbling.

Senator COATS. —mumbling during that last discussion. I thought maybe you would want to add something here.

Senator WELLSTONE. I am at a disadvantage because I do not know everyone's name. I think—I am sorry to point——

Ms. GALLAGHER. Maggie Gallagher.

Senator COATS. Maggie Gallagher.

Senator WELLSTONE. I think that Maggie's point is well taken, if you want to target it to low income do it by income of family. I do not think you do it by these other circumstances, and I do think—I have been very sympathetic to people I met in Minnesota where, you know, you got a couple making maybe 25,000, and they say, look, Paul, you know, one of us has chosen to stay home and is there not some way that there can be an acknowledgement of this? I mean we are really hard-pressed, too. And I am all for that. I want to make sure that, in fact, however, that we invest the resources to make sure that when we say we are helping, there is enough help that will really make a difference. That is one point.

The second point is I would be skeptical about Senator Coats just making it low income, and I hope we will not, because—and I do not think that is in the administration's proposal—because I think that then we invite the same kind of anger of you are barely above low income and you are hard-pressed as well, and I think a sliding-fee scale basis, you know, or some way that families pay a certain premium up to a certain percentage of monthly income and then you fill in the difference makes a lot of sense.

And then just one final point and I will be done. But as long as we are talking about the importance of a parent staying at home and how much we value that, I think then we better revisit or take a closer look at what is happening with the welfare bill because in that particular case, you have only got the one parent—right—and now that parent— almost always a woman—she is working, and I just would suggest to you, and I will be done on this, but from travel I have done around the country, and I swear I do no damage to the truth, we have either got situations like in LA where you have a waiting list of 30,000 for affordable child care even before the welfare bill or when you talk to these families the mother is working, but the arrangements are very ad hoc. I mean what is happening to these children, where they are and what kind of child care they are getting, because in this particular case, there is no option to stay at home any longer because the one parent is gone. We have somehow kind of put that in parenthesis and turned our gaze away from it, and it is a pretty frightening picture. There are too many 3 and 4-year olds that are at home or receiving care 1 week with a cousin and the next week or two or 3 weeks with a friend, and it is not good at all, and there are also too many first and second graders going home alone at the end of it. So I just want to throw those things into the equation.

Senator COATS. Let me ask Professor Belsky to respond here, but just before that I think it is important that we make sure we understand—we can take this up afterwards—but understand what we mean by ad hoc child care. Ad hoc, if we incorporate relatives,

neighbors, church child care, family child care outside the family but within a family confine, as opposed to say institutional care, if we are saying that that is ad hoc——

Senator WELLSTONE. No.

Senator COATS. —I think that is the preference of many mothers and families that have to engage in child care, and they frankly think it is preferable to institutional care.

Senator WELLSTONE. Well, Dan, just one quick thing. I meant it in a different way. I just said earlier that I believe it is terribly important that we understand that a parent makes this choice and that we reward that and support that. I agree with that premise as long as we can make sure that we make the investment so that we are really doing the job for affordable child care for families, whether they are working or not. My point—I was making a different point, which was I just want to point out on the welfare side that what happens—maybe I misspoke when I used the word "ad hoc"—what happens is the parent is not there any longer and it is a desperate situation where there is not the affordable child care, and it is like 1 week it is whoever you can get to do it, and then it is the next week it is someone else, and that is not what we want to see happening.

Senator COATS. Professor Belsky.

Mr. BELSKY. I wanted to come back to this issue of people who make sort of a single-wage earner choice not getting the benefit that people who make a dual-wage earner choice makes because the argument that Wade has made, and I think it is sound, and Maggie has made, is just fairness. But I want to come back to some of the findings of the NICHD study. One of the proclivities is to herald exclusively the findings pertaining to quality of care. Those should be heralded, however modest they are, but equally consistent are findings about just being in care and amount of care especially with regard to the mother-child relationship. I summarized those results.

It seems to me that in the face of evidence suggesting not whopping effects but persistent effects and consistent effects, that being in care looks like it is having some modest, minor even, negative effects on that mother-child relationship—I do not know how long they will last; I do not know what they will grow to—but having them is one more reason to say nobody should be penalized for choosing not to incur what might be a risk. And again I do not want to exaggerate that risk. I just want to come back to now it is not even an issue, not exclusively an issue of fair play— why should they get penalized for making that choice—but actually why should they be penalized for maybe making a choice that is in their and their child's best interest?

Senator COATS. And I think that is the operative question here that we as policy makers have to deal with. We are currently spending I think the figure is 13. something billion dollars on government's supplement to child care to provide child care. The president's proposal is advocating an additional $4 billion a year to that. But if there is a consensus here this morning, I believe that consensus is that the optimal care for a child is what is provided through that child's parents, and the question is should we structure incentives that move us toward optimal care or at least not

disadvantage what we consider optimal care as we consider the Federal involvement or any government involvement in the whole child care question? I think that is one of the operative questions. Yes?

Ms. BLANK. I would like to talk a little more about the families that Senator Wellstone and Assistant Secretary Golden talked about and also talk a little bit how to help all families because we certainly think that helping all families and helping families who need child care because they must work are not competing, and that it is very important to take apart all these issues carefully because I think there is a lot of misunderstanding just as there was with a discussion of ad hoc care. We did require millions of low-income mothers to go to work and many States are requiring them to go to work as young as 12 weeks and what they argue is why not because we only have a family leave policy that allows 12 weeks and we certainly do not have paid leave for all families so let these welfare mothers go to work.

Those mothers are joining millions of other mothers who must work to support their families. One out of three children whose mothers work are poor or would be poor if there mothers did not work. One out of four children under 3 in this country is poor. 29 percent of all mothers in the labor force with children under 6 are single mothers. That is a lot of mothers who have no choice. These mothers also do not have tax liabilities so any tax credit will not help them have the choice of staying at home. 34 million women in this country work in hourly jobs and half of them are paid $7.90 an hour or less. We know the income of young families has plummeted over the last 11 years so many families are working because they have no choice.

Now we know that government dollars and private dollars are not doing enough. We only serve one in ten children who are eligible for child care assistance or the child care block grant which is targeted on low-income families with sliding scale so as family's income goes up, they pay more. We know that States like New York serve one in ten eligible children. There are 200,000 children on the waiting list in California; 37,000 in Texas; 15,000 in New Jersey. But we also know that it is not just who you are serving. Many States are not serving all the families who are eligible. They are setting eligibility cutoffs very low, and many States have policies that are not encouraging quality child care because they do not have the resources. When you do not have the resources, you say should I help another family or should I pay providers? It is 50 percent of the market. And what we are doing in many States is making low-income women themselves, because the average child care provider earns $12,000 a year, and they do not get any kind of benefits like many low wage women. Should we pay them less because we want to serve more families or should we ask families who make poverty level pay more of the cost of care? In Maryland, when they raised copayments for families, they saw that people could not even use the child care subsidies. There are lots of mothers like this one in Florida who would do anything for what we may call a mediocre center, and it is clear the child care block grant allows families choice, and we think that is very important. Many families prefer a relative or a family day care provider.

Many families do not have relatives. Mrs. Garrett has three children. She is married. She makes 5.25 an hour behind the counter at a bagel cafe. Her shift started at six. She did not want to be late. Seven blocks on foot, and then she was hugging her children and handing them over to Vivien, a Bahamian woman who works nights at the self-service laundry where Mrs. Garrett does her wash. Vivien's small apartment was clean but sparsely furnished. There were no toys or books, just a television that the children spent most of the next ten hours watching. For this, Mrs. Garrett scraps together $50 a week, a little less than half the cost for just one child care in most licensed day care centers here. Mrs. Garrett hurried down the stairs and set off for work three miles away. The family car died a month ago. It breaks my heart leaving them there said Mrs. Garrett. I want them in a learning environment. This is the best I can do right now.

There are 25,000 children in Florida on the waiting list for child care. I think it is very important as we have this debate not to forget those children because those children easily get pushed aside. We can talk about equity and providing additional tax credits and other policies to help mothers stay home. There are many, many mothers who must work outside the home and the kind of jobs they take, if you are cleaning a hotel or you are working in a nursing home, you cannot bring your work home. And we have to ensure that those children are well cared for because our second national goal in addition to the first, which is helping families work, which is what the welfare bill said, is helping the children go to school ready to learn, and if we have all these families who have no choice, we have to make sure that their children are in good child care situations whether they be formal or informal.

Senator COATS. Thank you. Dr. Hunter.

Ms. HUNTER. I would like to just shift our focus a little bit, but first of all, I would like to say I was a single working mother some 20 years ago, and I did have a child in day care who did not flourish, and I did as a single parent work from home. That is one of my credentials. But I would like to shift the focus just a little bit away from what we have been talking about to what several of the speakers talked about which is what is happening to the kids? You know what is happening to the children in this country?

What we have been talking about today is sensitive, consistent and responsive nurturing that most child care experts, if not all, would agree that all of our children need. We are talking about what it means to be human or learning to be human and what is at risk when children receive early and extensive day care. Is this loss of intimacy? Is this loss of parental sensitivity that Dr. Belsky was referring to as one of the effects found in the NICHD study, and as Dr. Nicholi mentioned, this loss of impulse control that children have, this depression, this sense of worthlessness? All, I would say, attachment theory predicts, and that is what a lot of the research in infant day care has been premised on. So I would like to talk, if we can, about, you know, the future citizens that we are rearing as a society.

You know maternal sensitivity, folks, is societal gold. And I do not think we tamper with parental bonds with their children with ease. In fact, evidence from as early as the mid-1970's indicated

that those who began child care during their first year were more physically and verbally aggressive with peers and adults, less cooperative and less able to handle frustration than those who started care thereafter. So I would really like to—if we can—just focus a bit on some other comments about this. And Dr. Belsky, I would like to ask you, if you would, to amplify these findings of phase two of the NICHD study, this what you said lack of maternal sensitivity and negativity on the part of the father?

Mr. BELSKY. I am sorry. Those were not phase two findings. That was a study I have done locally in State College, PA, which was a sample. We were studying families over the toddler years.

Ms. HUNTER. Didn't you find something like that or at least with the mother in phase two of the NICHD study? Less sensitivity if the child had been in day care early on?

Mr. BELSKY. OK. What we are finding is—yes—but at 6 months we see these mothers being somewhat less sensitive.

Ms. HUNTER. Right.

Mr. BELSKY. By 15 months they are being more negative to their children.

Ms. HUNTER. OK.

Mr. BELSKY. By 24 and 36 months, their children are being less positively oriented toward them.

Ms. HUNTER. What can you say about the developmental trajectory?

Mr. BELSKY. Well, at this point, I think on the one hand you could say, gee, it looks bad. On the other hand, you know, the effects are small. Not all our outcomes suggest that. So I end up using the metaphor of going out in the morning and finding out that it is drizzling. You know something is happening here. It is not a bright sunny day. That drizzle can go away. That drizzle can turn into a downpour. That is these small effects could get worse. That drizzle can stay a small effect. At this juncture we just do not know. Fortunately we are following these children up. We are following these parent-child relationships up and hopefully we will illuminate that issue.

So I think we are in a situation where open-minded people can disagree honestly about, you know, how much to be worried, how little to be worried. Personally I think there is enough going on, and I have some discomfort with people saying, oh, the only thing that matters is quality.

Senator COATS. Is it fair to say that the sun is not shining and there is a drizzle——

Mr. BELSKY. I think so.

Senator COATS. —on the question of child care outside the parental home?

Mr. BELSKY. At least in terms of the parent-child relationship, there is.

Senator WELLSTONE. But could I ask a question that has confused me. I understand, doctor, what you are saying, but two questions. No. 1—and Dan, I do not think this is off the subject at all—I never heard any discussion about this at all when we were talking about having all these single parents/mothers work. We were just going to say you are going to work. Now, let me finish. So now

we are all of a sudden saying this is very important that that parent be at home.

Second of all, it seems to me they are very important findings, but we still have the economic reality of families. I know a lot of people who might say, whether it is the mother or the father, might say this would be great if we both did not have to work. But the fact of the matter is whatever the findings show seems to me there is an A and a B. The A part is you would want to have more families where one parent would be able to stay at home, but that would necessitate a different employment opportunity structure because people have to work, and if they do have to work and both of them have to work, let us make sure it is the very best developmental child care which could make a difference, a very positive difference. Is that not where we are heading regardless of what these studies suggest?

Senator COATS. Paul, if I could just—and then I would be happy to let anybody else respond, and I know Dr. Horn, you are trying to get a response here—but I think in response to the first question, clearly what we were looking at in welfare, and I think you raise a legitimate question, but what we were looking at, another dysfunction, a system which was perpetuating a culture of dependency which was very unhealthy for children, a moral atmosphere which was very unhealthy for children, and so we were trying to find our way out of that problem but did not mean it solved the other problem. But clearly there was a consensus that was reached, a majority consensus, not unanimous consensus, that welfare was destructive to children also and children trapped in that were not getting what they needed.

And the second question is one I asked before, and that is if there is a majority consensus, and I think there is, that the child's development is best enhanced, we are producing, giving the children the best chance for the future by recognizing that the emotional attachment to the mother and to the family in raising them and the consistency that you can provide through family care, is better for the child than the alternative. As Dr. Greenspan says, we have got to have a back-up system because we have these problems. But let us at least have incentives that support what we know is best for the child rather than just assume that both parents have to work and therefore bias all the support that government gives. Based on that assumption saying, well, maybe both parents do not have to work if we had more incentives for the mother to stay home.

Or perhaps we could have more, as was mentioned by one of the presenters—I think Dr. Greenspan—let us see if we can institute a culture which allows our organizations, business organizations, institutions and others, to be much more sensitive to that need and, therefore, structure work hours, work at home, staggered schedules, flex time, leave sharing, many of the things that Congressman Wolf has advocated, in a way that promotes what we know is best and not promote something that is second-best at the expense of what is best.

Mr. BETSKY. One of the things I think we need to do here is distinguish the first 5 years of life, at least somewhat as Dr. Greenspan tried to do in terms of developmental periods. And I guess one

of my concerns is that with the welfare bill, I would add, pushing mothers or fathers or whoever the parent is into the workplace, you know, virtually forcibly in that first year, and I think to speak generally about child care and work policies and family policies as if each year and the first year is equivalent misses some of the nuances and complexity. And what we may want to think about is sort of protecting the first 6 months, the first year.

In fact, some of the interesting data that come out of the NICHD study show that you can predict what is going on in that parent-child relationship at 2 and 3 years of age from how much time the parent is working and the kid is in care in the first 6 months of life. So it may be that if we had some kind of arrangements that protected expended or extended leave, better yet gave financial benefits to families during that period of time—I know that sounds like pie in the sky—then we might be making protections where we could, if you would, tolerate more care later on. So I think the big point is do not just treat all 5 years in the first 5 years as equivalent. They may not be.

Senator COATS. Let me go to this side with Wade Horn and then back to Dr. Greenspan.

Mr. HORN. There have been a lot of comments about supporting parental options, and I absolutely agree with that. I think that bad policy would be policy that would funnel children and parents into either one or a limited number of options. Even worse policy, though, would be to funnel parents into a limited number of options that they would not naturally choose if they had a real choice, and, as my kids say, an "even worser" option or policy would be to funnel kids into a limited number of options that not only would their parents not normally choose but that are bad for children in terms of child development.

And so the question is, you know, what is it that parents would choose if they had a range of options that were available to them and what is good for kids? Well, the thing that is most concerning to me about what we have heard here today is that it is not just quality that matters but also quantity. I mean we should not feign great surprise that quality matters. You know I mean I would be shocked if low quality child care, neglectful child care, did wonderful things for kids. You know the idea that low quality is worse than good quality is not the most shocking finding I have ever heard in my life. What is a little bit more concerning, and something we ought to take very seriously, is this notion of quantity regardless of quality. That is if kids spend large number of hours per week in child care that their development is in some ways arrested. So on the one question, you know, what is good for kids, certainly quality is good, but we have to pay attention to this quantity issue.

The second is what would parents choose? Well, surveys show that what parents would love to choose in the first 4 years of life in particular is either care by themselves, one of the parents, or care by relatives, and that when you ask parents what kind of help do you want from the government, it is the rare parent—I am sorry—it is the rare parent that says, you know, in my greatest dreams what I want from the government is that they make sure I can put my kid in more child care so I can spend more time at the office. Most parents say the help I want from government is

that I have to spend less time at the office so I can spend more time with my kids. So the policy that you all need to wrestle with in Congress, and it is a difficult one, is balancing a range of options while taking into consideration, it seems to me, what is good for kids, and also what is it that parents in the end want?

Now, in the issue of low-income parents, I would just like to commend this Congress. I mean the fact of the matter is there is $30 billion in the welfare law over the next 5 years to support child care for low-income parents, those, the very ones that we are talking about that have to go to work, including $4 billion in new money as a result of the welfare reform law. Now even here in Washington, $30 billion is a lot of money. I emphasize that is with a "B," not with an "M". $30 billion. And I do not know of any evidence, and I would like to hear it, the evidence that I hear is that States right now are awash in money, that welfare reform block grant through TANF, that states are talking about surpluses, and that child care availability at the moment is not a great impediment to moving previously welfare-dependent parents into the paid labor force.

Senator WELLSTONE. Can Helen respond to that? And I would like to.

Senator COATS. I have been putting Dr. Greenspan on hold here for some time. You almost gave me the perfect segue into part two, which is what do parents really want, because we are going to take a break in about five minutes for 15 minutes and then start panel two. We could do all day on panel one, I understand that. So let me just finish up by letting Dr. Greenspan respond and then Senator Wellstone and maybe the three of you—no, the three of you probably could not collaborate on this answer. [Laughter.] But maybe two of you could. But we will try to do that and then wrap up. First, Dr. Greenspan.

Dr. GREENSPAN. I will try to be brief to facilitate this. I think we have three goals we can accommodate many of the different viewpoints expressed in the panel. One goal is to create incentives and education to help parents who can and are able to care for their own babies and toddlers, particularly in the early years. I think we have a pretty strong sentiment for that. Two, I think we all agree that there are certain situations that require a variety of child care options, and we need to have better options for everyone. It means better training, stronger day care, stronger other kinds of options. And three, better programs for at-risk families, biologically at-risk children as well as environmentally at risk. Now in that third area, the at risk, and in the second area, better training and better child care, I think we have to get serious.

And here is the problem, I think. I have worked for many years with children who are at emotional risk and also biological risk, and here is where I think the Federal programs have missed the boat, and I think we can do more of the same and waste billions of dollars, by putting into practice inadequate back-up systems. Right now to take, now there are welfare moms who are very healthy, can provide good care for their babies, and really need someone to help them out while they are working. I would advocate that we need a more flexible system of welfare that in the first 2 years of life, we should not force an able-bodied, loving, nurturing

mom to work full time. I would say a part-time work option until the children are 3, moving into a full-time work option, and that would enable us to not get into this terrible system where we are forcing an able, nurturing, loving mommy to put her child in a less useful system of care creating risk in a new baby, which is just the opposite of what we want. So it does not make sense, and it did not make sense not to have that in the original provision of the welfare—and we should put it in now.

No. 2, there will be moms and dads—welfare and nonwelfare—who are unable to care healthfully for a baby or child, at-risk family circumstances due to alcohol, substance abuse, mental health problems and family dysfunction. There, and some of those will be poverty families, there we need more than we are currently doing. There simply having quote "affordable child care" will not do the trick. One, because that affordable child care for a baby is not so great anyhow; and number two, they need much more. And if we are serious about helping the truly at risk, we have to have a more robust and a more energetic program. And we know how to do that now. We have made mistakes in the past. We have not done it well, but we can do it well now. We need the resources and we need the commitment to do it. So I say if we are truly concerned with at risk, if we are truly concerned with poverty or low income, we can do much better, and we have to combine it in a three-tier program: support for families, better back-up systems, and much better programs for the at-risk.

Senator COATS. Yes, Maggie.

Ms. GALLAGHER. Just briefly, in a cheerful and helpful spirit, I would like to advise Senator Wellstone that most married homemakers that I know do not believe and do not appreciate being seen as cognates of dependent welfare mothers, and that there is, in fact, no body of academic research that suggests that these are similar situations, that, in fact, married women who take care of their kids, their children do fine, and long-term welfare dependent mothers have a negative impact compared to other low-income mothers.

And second, I think we need to be careful about describing women as having no other choices, even low income women. It may be true at a given period in time, but that low-income woman who feels right now she has no choice may uncover choices, may develop choices. She may have a relative become available. She might even get married and be able to cut back if we are careful to structure benefits even to her in such a way that we do not penalize the choices that involve minimizing involvement in commercial child care.

And finally, I would just like to say we do know what quality is. Dr. Greenspan gave an eloquent description of it. It is long-term, loving relationships, incredible emotional investment in the child. What we do not know—that does not mean because we know what quality is that we know how from Washington, DC to make sure that every child has that care, and I think that parents who are choosing commercial child care should beware of the idea that anything that happens here is going to be able to guarantee that for their child.

Senator COATS. Yes, Olivia.

Ms. GOLDEN. I just wanted to say one last thing about the quality point because I am so struck by this as a really optimistic outcome from today. Several people around the table have said that we do have a consensus on what quality is even though there are also other things we need to know and have treated that as though it were a small thing, but in fact—and many people here have been working on this issue for much longer than I have—to have a consensus in the Congress and in State houses all over the country that we know what quality is for very young children, that we should invest in it, and that it matters, I think is an extraordinary thing. And I actually had a wonderful conversation with a parent about a week ago who had had low quality family child care and now had high quality through an early Head Start investment, and she could tell me—I mean we cannot underestimate parents—she could tell me what it was that was different, the engagement of this family child care provider with her child, the fact that her children were happy before they went and when they came back, that there was a schedule, there was an engagement, as opposed to watching TV, which was the previous time.

So I just feel, Senator Coats, that if the one outcome from this session is this consensus around what quality care means and how to invest in it, that would be an extraordinary accomplishment.

Senator WELLSTONE. Dan, can I respond quickly?

Senator COATS. You sure can.

Senator WELLSTONE. In a cheerful and friendly way.

Senator COATS. You can respond in any way you want. Even if it not cheerful and friendly, we will let you respond. [Laughter.]

Senator WELLSTONE. The similarity is not the—nor did I make that argument—that when you have got two parents at home, two parents working and one parent at home, maybe the mother, that is the same as AFDC, or for that matter when you have a single parent but she is working that is the same as AFDC. The argument I was making was quite the other, which Dr. Greenspan was talking about, which is that if we are going to say that a loving, supportive relationship between a mother or father and a child is important, that also can happen with AFDC families, and we need to understand that. Otherwise, we are engaging in sort of the worst kind of scapegoating and stereotyping, and I did not see that really very much a part of our policy debate, and I do think there are important questions to be asked about what we have done.

On the whole issue of affordable child care, we just must be sort of traveling in different parts of the country or talking to different people, but I, in my State of Minnesota, which does pretty well on these issues, we have long waiting lists for affordable child care, and we are terribly worried that it becomes a zero sum game where all of a sudden a welfare mother has a child care slot and then working poor or moderate income people do not. It is a huge problem. We have long waiting lists for affordable, for affordable child care.

I am glad there is agreement on standards or at least it seems like we are moving that way. I think all of us have talked about, you know, high quality care. But my last point, Dan, would be that I really want to include myself in the company of those who have argued that we ought not to have a bias in terms of the funding

stream or the funding away from people who want to stay at home as long as that does not lead to two things: (a) all of a sudden the opposite kind of discrimination where all of a sudden we are looking down on a parent or parents for working. I do not think that ought to be the flip side of the coin. And (b) let us understand that this is going to, therefore, mean yet even more an investment of resources because a benefit for the family that is staying at home should not all of a sudden be less for the family where one or both parents have to work. So I just want to make that clear.

Senator COATS. In conclusion here, and I really hate to cut it off, we do have a second question, and that is what do families really want, and we have presenters and respondents to that also. We do need to take a break. I regret that we did not have more time to address the question that Diane Fisher raised, and that is that do we as a society need to examine the cultural message that is currently being sent, sent through legislative activities, sent through policy makers, sent through the media, which is different than the message, primarily the message that we heard here this morning? And that message is that we are in an age where there is more focus on what parents are actually doing and on the importance of child care to support what they are doing than there is on the question of what do children really need.

And the first part of this panel, the operative question, before we determine policy, I believe it is important to ask what do children really need and how can we as a society best address those needs? It may be that we need a debate within our society, within our culture, and you said correct the cultural message. Because if what we heard here this morning is correct and that is that there is, whether it is a drizzle or a steady rain or a downpour, if there is a consensus on a negative outcome, not defining what that degree of negativity is at this point, a negative outcome for children who are separated from their parents, whether it is through divorce, whether it is through death, or whether it is through child care, and that quantity time is not available as well as quality time, then it seems that we as a society need to address that cultural question and fashion our policies or at least be sensitive in putting our policies together toward that question.

And regrettably, I think with that, we will draw a close to this first panel, take a 15-minute break, and at 3 minutes after five begin the second question of what do parents really want? Thank you. Thanks to all of presenters, members of the Congress that are here, and our respondents.

[Recess.]

Senator COATS. Again, we want to thank the first panel and the respondents and we are pleased now to move to our second question. Having discussed and raised but not, I am sure, exhausted the first question about what children need, we are looking at the other half of that equation: what do parents want? What are their goals and desires for being with their children, raising their children relative to child care and so forth?

We are privileged to have four distinguished presenters: Ellen Galinsky, Darcy Olsen, Danielle Crittenden, and Anita Blair. And then we are pleased to have four respondents: Heidi Brennan, Charmaine Yoest, Robert Rector and Michael Lotito.

Let me first introduce our presenters. Ellen Galinsky is President and Co-founder of the Families and Work Institute, a nonprofit institute conducting policy research on issues of the changing workforce and changing family lives. Ms. Galinsky is the past President of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, the largest professional education for early childhood educators. Ellen, we are pleased to have you with us today. If you want to come forward and make your presentation, or you can do it from there, whatever is most comfortable for you. Thank you.

STATEMENTS OF ELLEN GALINSKY, FAMILY AND WORK INSTITUTE; DARCY OLSEN, THE CATO INSTITUTE; DANIELLE CRITTENDEN, THE WOMAN'S QUARTERLY; AND ANITA BLAIR, INDEPENDENT WOMEN'S INSTITUTE

Ms. GALINSKY. Thank you. When people talk about child care research, there is often an either/or sort of discussion: parental care is good, child care is bad; mothers should stay at home, mothers should work. And what I want to do this afternoon is to try to reframe the discussion and talk about not one side or one size fits all but the continuum that really fits into today's world. I think that there is—I do want to make a point that follows up on this morning's discussion which is that the early research on child care used to talk about child-care-raised children versus home-raised children, and I think that we have hopefully come a long way from that, that all parents whether or not they use child care raise their own children, and that the child care is a support of part of the continuum of care.

I also want to talk about the cultural messages. We have followed the media on this issue, whether mothers should work or whether mothers should not work, for a long time. And you see a real pendulum, it is good, it is bad, it is good, it is bad, it is good, it is bad, and I guess for some reason we are not so comfortable with the fact that it can be good, it can be bad, and that it is more complicated than that. I would like to address a series of questions and respond with data.

The first is should policy or practice support parents in caring for their own children or should they support nonparental care? And if I could have the first overhead, please. I think that we know the statistics about how many mothers work. We also can look at the share of money that mothers contribute to the family. We did a national study of the U.S. workforce that will be released on April 16, and we found that among families with employed mothers, and they are dual-earner families, mothers contribute 39 percent of household earnings. We also find that 19 percent of employed parents with children under 18 are either in single parent families and are either the sole support or have the major responsibility for supporting these families. And there is a really interesting finding. I am glad that today's discussion has not just talked about mothers because we find that among the single-parent families, one in four, 27 percent, is now a single-parent father. And as we talked about earlier, we expect the number of single-parent mothers to increase.

In a study that we did a few years ago, we found that—we did it for the Whirlpool Foundation—we found that mothers had enlarged their definition of what it meant to care for their families.

We called it the new provider because mothers now seem to define themselves as caring for their families in terms of nurturing them and supporting them economically. This overhead talks about the fact that even among families where the mother works very few hours, they still use a fair amount of nonparental care. It shows at the top that 35 percent of when mothers only work one to nine hours a week use nonparental care, and it bounces down to about eight to 12 percent for people who work longer, and even among mothers who are not in the labor force, 32 percent use some form of nonparental care. OK. We can take that one off.

Should there be support then for employees with children to work fewer hours? Well, it is clear that parents are really feeling that there is what is often called a time famine, that parents are feeling very pressed for time, and they worry about families not having enough time together. We found in our National Study of the Changing Workforce that two-thirds of parents would prefer to work fewer hours, and if you could put the next overhead up, it shows how many hours parents were scheduled to work, how many hours they actually worked, what they prefer to work, and the difference between their actual and preferred hours.

If you look at those patterns, you see that the difference between what mothers, for example, would prefer to work and what they are scheduled to work is about 3.2 hours, and for fathers it is about 3.7 hours. So what parents are really saying is they would like to work closer to what they are scheduled to work on average. They want to eliminate the extra hours and our research shows that jobs have become more demanding and people are working longer hours.

Now it is important to note that the number of hours that parents work, and here is another either/or that I want to argue with, that the number of hours that parents work are only weakly associated with all of the outcomes that we look at in terms of parental well-being. And that the job itself, the quality of the job itself, is very strongly linked or associated statistically with parental well-being. And Jay Belsky talked about the findings from the NICHD study showing that parents who work longer hours might put very young children at risk, but I think that there is still a debate about this issue. The debate tends to be it is either quality time or quantity time, and I would like to argue that you cannot have one without the other. It is what you do in the hours that you have and that you need both that really makes the difference.

In terms of what Stan Greenspan suggested about working split shifts and caring for your children, there is not research, to my knowledge, on how that affects kids, but we do know that it can affect marriages in negative ways. So we need to look at a range of solutions that will look for different families.

My next question is should policies support one form of care over another? And I guess that—you can put up the next overhead—the way that I look at it is that it is not really the name up on the door, it is what happens inside that really makes the difference. And parents choose a whole variety of arrangements. You can see that they vary depending on how much time the parent works, the age of the child, family income, and the supply of local child care. But if you look at quality, at least among regulated family child

care and center care, there really is not very much difference. We found in a study that we did of family child care and relative care that the average care was 3.92 and the four-state study that the University of Chicago did the average was 4.0. That puts it in the mediocre range where one equals terrible and seven equals good.

But we found, and I think perhaps surprisingly, that relative care was, in fact, poor, and that was a terrible shock to me in our study of children and family child care and relative care. We found that children were no more likely to be securely attached to a relative than a nonrelative, and we found that the quality was, in fact, lower, and that sent us back into digging deeply into the data. And what we finally found is that relatives did not necessarily want to take care of their relatives. Only 23 percent of them would have done this if they had had a choice. So we cannot make assumptions just because it is a relative or just because it is a family or just because it is—I do not like the idea of commercial care; I really like to think of a continuum of care—but we really have to look at what is actually happening inside and what is best for that family and for that child to really talk about it.

I have done a study where I am talking to kids about how they see their working parents these days so I can get kids' read on all of these issues, but I can tell it is very clear in a family when child care is working because they describe it, whether it is a center, whether it is family child care, whether it is a relative or neighbor, they describe it as an extended family. It becomes the kid's kin system. So that is why I like to think of the continuum of care.

The next point that I want to make is that many parents do not feel that they have choices in child care. We find in the various studies that we have done that between 58 and 75 percent of parents who look for alternatives feel that they have zero other choices.

The next point that I want to make addresses the question of, well, if child care is mediocre, is it possible to improve its quality? It is something that was discussed before. And we have done studies in about eight States that have looked at this issue, and we found that, yes, in fact, being sensitive and responsive can be taught. Big surprise. But it can be taught. We found in a study of training that companies supported in 44 sites called Family to Family by Child Care Aware that children became more securely attached to their providers following training and the quality of the care giving environments had improved. On March 8, we are about to release a study in Florida where we have followed it over 4 years, a regulatory change with better staff-child ratios and higher educational requirements, and we found that children's cognitive development improved, children were observed to be more securely attached, they spent more time in learning activities. We found an increased proficiency with language and decreased behavior problems, and that the scores came up to almost the good level, and when teachers met more stringent requirements, that is when they had better staff-child ratios, better than Florida had regulated, or they had a college degree and some early childhood training, in fact, the quality was on average good. So these things can be taught. We have followed them over time and we see that they can be taught.

My final question is who should be responsible for addressing this in terms of the either/or notion? Should it be families, should it be government, or should it be business? And the point that I want to make here with the next overhead is that employers, that the average parent, particularly a parent who is from a low-income family or a single parent, does not get very much help from employers. That next overhead shows you that overall people who are lower income or at smaller employer sites have less access to child care resource and referral. One in five employees now has that access. 12 percent—in the next overhead, it shows you that 12 percent of employees with children under 6 have access to or are near to a child care center operated or sponsored by their employers. And the next overhead shows you that 12 percent get financial assistance with their child care. I know I am moving fast, but my time is up. And similarly in terms of financial assistance, 13 percent have access to that.

I am just going to skip ahead to say that employees do not even have access, that many employees do not have access to even more basic employee assistance either. For example, 12 percent of employed parents from low income households and 11 percent of single parents with young children do not have access to health insurance for their children from any source. 64 percent of employed parents with young children from low income households and 63 percent of single parents do not have access to paid time off and so forth. And we talked about working at home, and we know that 28 percent of employees can work at home during their regular hours, but many of the large companies that have work-at-home options or flex-place options require child care. So it does not necessarily mean that if you are going to work at home, that you do not need child care.

So the responsibility, I believe, for addressing the child care needs of employees belongs first and foremost to employed parents. I believe strongly that we need to support families in whatever choice they make. We need to support them to stay at home. We need to support them to work. And I hope that we can move the discussion away from a one-size-fits-all, from the polarized kinds of discussion where child care is good or bad, and where we really work together to try to improve the options and choices and supports that we give to families. Thank you.

Senator COATS. Thank you, Ellen. Appreciate your presentation.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Galinsky follows:]

CHILD CARE
REFRAMING THE DEBATE

by Ellen Galinsky
Families and Work Institute

When child care research is discussed, the ensuing debate tends to become polarized. There are implicit or explicit assumptions that mothers should be at home or should work; that child care is good or bad for children; and that the solution therefore should either support mothers (or fathers) to stay at home—perhaps even work at home, or to work outside the home. As I conduct my own research and read the research of others, this notion of one side or the other doesn't fit. If one listens to the voices of families, it really doesn't fit. So is a debate of what often turns into "either/or" I will argue for need for "both."

Should policy and practice support parents in caring for their own children or support nonparental care?

Finding 1: Approximately three in five mothers with children under six are employed

- The recent figures on maternal employment from the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate that the majority of mothers with children under six are employed. In March 1997, 60 percent of mothers with children under six were employed. Overall, 57 percent of mothers with children under three and 64 four percent with children three to five were employed.
- Among mothers with children under six who are married, 61 percent were employed. Among single mothers with children under six, 58 percent were employed.

Finding 2: Employed mothers contribute significantly to family income.

The Families and Work Institute's nationally representative study of the US workforce—the 1997 National Study of the Changing Workforce (to be released April 16, 1998)—provides information about the earnings of employed parents.

- According to the National Study of the Changing Workforce, employed mothers with children under 18 in dual-earner households contribute 39 percent of household earnings.
- Of course, not all families have two earners. Nineteen percent of employed parents with children under 18 are single parents with the sole or major responsibility for supporting their families. Of these, three in four is a single parent mother, and one in four (27 percent) is a single parent father.
- It is furthermore expected that welfare reform will increase the number of single parent mothers in the workforce.

in a study we conducted for The Whirlpool Foundation, we found that employed mothers seem to have enlarged their definition of caring for their families to include nurturing as well as providing for their families economically.

Finding 3: The majority of employed parents with young children, even those working very few hours, use some form of nonparental care.

The National Center for Educational Statistics' National Household Educational Survey from October 1995 documents the use of nonparental child care among employed and nonemployed mothers.

- Almost two-thirds of mothers (65 percent) with children under six-years-old who work between one and nine hours weekly use some form of nonparental care while 88 percent of mothers of young children who work 40 or more hours per week do so.

TABLE 1: USE OF NONPARENTAL CARE BY EMPLOYED MOTHERS WITH CHILDREN UNDER SIX

Weekly work hours of mothers	Use of nonparental care	No use of nonparental care
1-9	65%	35%
10-19	71	29
20-29	75	25
30-34	83	17
35-39	92	8
40 or more	88	12
Total among working mothers	83	17

Source: National Education Survey, US National Center for Educational Statistics, October 1995

- Even among mothers not in the labor force, 32 percent use some form of nonparental care.

Should policy and practice support parents in caring for their own children or support nonparental care? Given the above data, it seems to me that public and private efforts should support both.

Should there be support for employees with children to work fewer hours?

Finding 4: Parents would prefer to work fewer hours.

The study that the Families and Work Institute conducted for The Whirlpool Foundation found that employed parents feel pressed for time and worry about families not having enough time together.

- According to the National Study of the Changing Workforce, two-thirds of employed parents would *prefer* to work fewer hours.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- When one asks about the number of preferred work hours, however, employed mothers want to work 32 hours a week on average (or 3.2 hours less than they are scheduled to work) while employed fathers want to work 37.9 hours (or 3.7 hours less than they are scheduled to work).

Thus, it appears that while employed parents would prefer fewer hours, they especially want to eliminate the extra hours they work. Cutting back hours also can entail reducing income which for some families could be difficult.

TABLE 3: SCHEDULED, ACTUAL AND PREFERRED WEEKLY HOURS BY EMPLOYED MOTHERS WITH CHILDREN UNDER 18

Employee group	Scheduled weekly hours at main job	Actual weekly hours at all jobs	Preferred weekly hours	Difference between actual and preferred weekly hours
Employed mothers	35.8	41.4	32	9.4
Employed fathers	41.6	50.9	37.9	13

Source: *Families and Work Institute, 1997 National Study of the Changing Workforce*

It is important to note that our research at the Families and Work Institute indicates that the number of hours worked is only weakly associated—or not associated at all—with parental well-being. Job factors (such as job autonomy, job security, and having a supportive supervisor) are the most significant in predicting most outcomes. Neither is simply the number of hours worked strongly associated with children's well-being in most studies of parental employment.

Merely looking at the hours that parents and children spend together or apart gives an incomplete picture of the impact of parental employment. Although the public debate tends to separate "quality time" from "quantity time" and asks which is best, studies of children's development indicate that the quality and quantity of time are inextricably linked and both should be supported.

Should policy promote one form of child care over another?

Finding 5: While different forms of child care are better for individual children, there is no one best form of child care.

The use of various forms of care depends on the age of the child, family income, and the supply of local child care. The preceding table shows how some of these factors affect parental selection.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

46-800 98 - 3

TABLE 3: REGULAR CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS FOR CHILDREN UNDER SIX

	Total non-parental	Relative	Nonrelative	Center	No non-parental
Total	60%	21%	18%	31%	40%
Maternal employment					
35 hours or more	68	33	32	39	12
Less than 35 hours	75	30	26	35	25
Household income					
Less than $10,001	50	22	10	25	50
$75,000 or more	77	14	30	49	23

Source: National Education Survey, US National Center for Educational Statistics, October 1995

Finding 6: Multi-site studies have found very similar global quality ratings for regulated family child care and center care.

- In the 1994 Study of Children in Family Child Care and Relative Care by the Families and Work Institute, the average quality rating among regulated providers was 3.92 on a scale where 1=inadequate, 3=mediocre, 5=good, and 7=excellent.
- A 1995 four-state study by the University of Colorado at Denver found that the average center was rated at 4.0 or mediocre in quality.
- Perhaps surprisingly, children being cared for by relatives were no more likely than those cared for by regulated or nonregulated providers to behave as if they felt safe and secure with their providers.
- Relative care received lower quality ratings in The Study of Children in Family Child Care and Relative Care than nonrelative care. Further investigation revealed that relative care was lower in quality when the providers were less "intentional." Intentionality is defined as being committed to providing care, thinking ahead and planning what one wants to do with the children, and seeking out opportunities to learn more about caring for children, and so forth. Only 23 percent of the relatives in this study saw child care as their chosen work.

Clearly, given a range of family need and finances, no one form of child care should be promoted over another. However, it makes sense for employers and government to support programs and providers who are intentional about caring for children.

What do families want when they select child care?

Finding 7: Parents want their children to be safe; to have providers who communicate with them about what is going on with their child; to have providers who pay attention to their child; and to have providers who are warm and caring.

- Interestingly enough, these are the same factors that researchers would consider crucial to children's positive growth and development. In The Study of Children in Family Child Care and Relative Care, the two factors most strongly associated with positive child outcomes were the warmth (or sensitivity) of the provider and her or his responsiveness to the child.

Finding 8: Many parents do not feel they have choices in the child care they select.

- In the 1992 National Study of the Changing Workforce, 27 percent of employed parents seriously considered using other arrangements when they selected their child care arrangement for their youngest child under 13. Of these, 58 percent reported finding no other acceptable choices.

Given the fact that child care is, on average, mediocre, is it possible to improve its quality?

Finding 9: Several studies indicate that it is possible to improve child care quality in ways that affect children's development.

A multi-site study of family child care training—Family to Family— funded by several businesses conducted by the Families and Work Institute reveals that:

- Children were more likely to be securely attached to their providers following training, and that the quality of the caregiving environments had improved.

In another study conducted by the Families and Work Institute (to be released March 8, 1998) where state government in Florida legislated higher staff-to-child ratios and higher educational requirements for staff, we have followed these changes since 1992 and have found that:

- Children's cognitive development had improved in 1994 and continued to improve in 1996 as evidenced by the fact that children engaged in more cognitively complex play with other children and with classroom materials.

- Children were also observed to be more securely attached to their teachers in 1994 and even more so in 1996, an indication of sound emotional development.

- In addition, children spent more time in learning activities in 1996 than in 1994.

- In 1994, we found increased proficiency with language among children and decreased behavior problems, including aggression, anxiety, and hyperactivity. These gains held in 1996.

- On a scale measuring classroom quality where a score of 1 equals inadequate, 3 equals mediocre, 5 equals good, and 7 equals excellent, Florida's scores increased from 4.17 in 1992 to 4.37 in 1996.

- Increased staff education and more rigorous ratio requirements did not have a marked negative impact on the child care marketplace nor did requirements significantly impact consumer costs during the 1992-1996 period.

Who should be responsible for addressing the problems that parents face with child care—its quality, cost, accessibility? Should it be families, government, or business?

Finding 10: Although a number of employed parents receive child care assistance from their employers, most are not served.

- According to the National Study of the Changing Workforce, only one in five employees with children under six works for an employer that offers a program or service that helps employees find child care. Access is higher for workers from households with higher income and for those who work for large companies.

Table 4: Access To Child Care Resource and Referral By Employee Group With Children Under Six

Employee Group	Access		No Access
Family income			
$25K or less *(n=113)*	16%	*	84%
$25K-$70K *(n=286)*	18		82
$70K or more *(n=104)*	28		72
US employees			
Fewer than 50 *(n=161)*	11	***	89
50-999 *(n=144)*	8		92
1000 or more *(n=203)*	35		65

Significance Levels: * p<.05; *** p<.001;

Source: *Families and Work Institute. 1997 National Study of the Changing Workforce*

- Overall, 13 percent of employees with children under six report that they have access to a child care center operated or sponsored by their employer at or near their work location. Workers at large companies are more likely to have child care at the job.

Table 5: Access To On Or Near Site Child Care By Employee Group With Children Under Six

Employee Group	Access		No Access
US employees			
Fewer than 50 *(n=163)*	9%	***	91%
50-999 *(n=148)*	6		94
1000 or more *(n=206)*	18		82

*Significance Levels: *** p<.001*
Source: Families and Work Institute, 1997 National Study of the Changing Workforce

- Twelve percent of employed parents with children under six work for employers that provide employees with direct financial assistance—vouchers, cash or scholarships—to help employees defray the cost of child care. Full-time employees and those who work for larger employers are the most likely to receive financial assistance for child care.

Table 6: Access To Financial Assistance For Child Care By Employee Group With Children Under Six

Employee Group	Financial Assistance		No Financial Assistance
Work status			
Full time *(n=450)*	13%	*	87%
Part time *(n=69)*	4		96
US employees			
Fewer than 50 *(n=163)*	4	***	96
50-999 *(n=147)*	9		91
1000 or more *(n=200)*	20		80

*Significance Levels: * p<.05; *** p<.001.*
Source: Families and Work Institute, 1997 National Study of the Changing Workforce

Another way that employers help employees pay for child care is by setting up Dependent Care Assistance Plans allowed under federal tax law. Employees set aside part of their pretax wages into an account that can be used to pay for child care.

- Thirty percent of employees with children under six have access to DCAPs. Those more likely to have access are employees who have higher hourly earnings, who have higher family income, who are married, and who work for larger employers. In fact, 47% of employees with young children who work for large companies have access to DCAPs.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 7: Access To Dependent Care Assistance Plans By Employee Group With Children Under Six

Employee Group	Access to DCAPs		No Access to DCAPs
Hourly earnings			
$7.70 or less (n=113)	30%	---	80%
$7.70-$19 (n=243)	38		72
$19 or more (n=124)	63		57
Family income			
$30K or less (n=109)	33	---	87
$30K-$70K (n=382)	51		69
$70K or more (n=102)	64		56
Marital status			
Married/partnered (n=438)	52	*	66
Single (n=73)	50		80
US employees			
Fewer than 50 (n=101)	33	---	87
50-999 (n=150)	57		73
1000 or more (n=260)	61		53

Significance Levels: * p<.05; *** p<.001

Source: Families and Work Institute, 1997 National Study of the Changing Workforce

Many employed parents don't have access to even some basic employee assistance either.

- For example, 13 percent of employed parents from low-income households and 11 percent of single parents with young children do not have access health insurance for their children from any source.

- 64 percent of employed parents with young children from low-income households and 63 percent of single parents with young children do not have access to paid time off to care for their children.

- 69 percent of employed parents with young children from low-income households and 63 percent of single parents with young children do not have access to traditional flextime.

- Only 28 percent of parents with children under six have the opportunity to work at least part of their regular hours at home. Obviously, it is impossible for some jobs to be done at home. Furthermore, working at home does not negate the need for child care for many parents. In fact, many large employers require that employees have child care if they are going to work at home.

- Finally, between one fourth and one third of employed parents with young children report that the work-family culture of their workplace is not supportive to them as family members.

The responsibility for addressing the child care needs of employees belongs first and foremost to employed parents, but to do so, they will need the support of employers and government.

I hope that we can move the child care debate in this country away from the notion that one size fits all--that mothers should work or mothers should stay at home; that child care is good or bad for children. Many mothers and fathers have redefined their roles. By caring for their children they include nurturing them emotionally and supporting them financially. It is my hope that the rest of society can support families in both of these roles.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Senator COATS. Our next presenter is Darcy Olsen. Darcy is the entitlements policy analyst with the Cato Institute in Washington. She has done extensive research on child care, health care, welfare, and Social Security, and in particular has examined how entitlements affect children and the poor. Darcy, we appreciate having you with us and look forward to your presentation.

Ms. OLSEN. Thank you, Senator, for having us all here today. Thank you all for sitting out there. I was out there for awhile, and I know that those chairs are pretty hard, and you are in your third hour, so thanks. You look pretty perky out there. I am in a certain sense the child that this debate or was the child that this debate is about today. I grew up from the time I was 3-years old with a single mom, who worked as a waitress. We, my brother and I, were in a variety of day-care settings. We went from everything from commercial day care to family day care to center-based care. You name it. We were in it. And we were also the family that we were addressing that the woman from the Department of Health and Human Services was talking about today. We were the family that needed food stamps. And we were the family that used free lunch. My worst memory about child care is not probably what you might think. It was not not being attached to my mother. I knew that mother had to work and I was okay with that. It was not having an inattentive provider because I had a brother with me all the time, and we were good friends. My worst experience in child care was powdered milk. I don't know how many of you have ever had to drink powdered milk on a regular basis, but I could not stand it—as I enjoy my water here.

But I am telling you this for an important reason. It might be interesting to you to find out what my background is, but like the rest of the anecdotes that have been presented here today, my story has very little real significance in this debate. What matters in this debate are the cold hard facts, the facts that speak for millions and millions of kids in this country, and that is what I am here to talk to you about today. Those who study child care generally assess the market by looking at three things: they look at availability, they look at affordability, and they look at quality. We have talked about all of those things today. What the studies show is that there is no crisis in child care in the child care market. Child care is available. It is affordable, and it is of the good quality that parents seek.

First of all, we will go briefly into availability. The most comprehensive study that was done on the availability of child care in this country, which was actually cosponsored or rather done under contract for the Department of Education, showed that there was a 12 percent vacancy rate in centers across the country. That is commercial child care. That vacancy rate did not vary according to the region or according to urban or rural location. In addition, there are over a million unregulated family providers in the country. 40 percent of them say that they would be willing to take more children. In addition, the studies that have studied the market show that as demand increases for child care, the market expands to absorb those children. So in terms of availability, child care is available.

OK, fine, you are saying, it is available, but is it affordable? Because the anecdotes we have heard today would suggest to you that it is only available for the wealthy. Not true. Fees for child care in the country have risen less than five percent in the last 25 years. OK. You are saying, okay, they have not risen, but what are they? For a family below poverty, the average fee is $50 a week. For a family above poverty, it is $75 a week. Is that too much or too little? Well, nine out of ten parents say that they would pay more for those arrangements. So I am not here to tell you whether it is affordable for parents. I am here to tell you that parents say that child care is affordable.

Looking at the quality debate, which is the third way that people generally assess child care, the anecdotes really run wild on this. There is a study that is often talked about, the Cost, Quality, and Outcome Study Team, and a lot of people talked about it. It is the Colorado study sometimes. It has a lot of names. And it is the study that found that 75 percent of the care in child care settings is of mediocre quality. But what nobody told you was how the people defined mediocre quality. Mediocre quality was defined as when the children's basic health and safety needs were met, when the provider was warm and loving, and when some educational opportunities were provided. That was called mediocre care. That is important for you to know when you listen to anecdotes and certainly when you are evaluating the studies that people are putting out there.

But I would say this. Parents seek quality. It is more important than cost or convenience when they are looking for child care arrangements. It is just that parents unlike certain officials have many ways of defining what quality care is, and that is because parents are all different, and that is okay. Some parents define quality as something that is linked to the provider, whether or not the provider is warm and loving and attentive and good to their child. Those parents generally choose relative care or neighbors for their children. There are other parents who define quality as educational opportunities. That is okay, too. Those parents generally choose preschool, educational preschools, Montessori schools, and programs like that. But what we know is that parents think that quality is more important than anything else when they look for child care arrangements.

And what we know is that 96 percent of parents in this country say that they are satisfied with their current child care arrangements. That is all child care arrangements— moms staying at home, moms and dads, using child care centers—but 96 percent say that they are satisfied with their arrangements. They seek quality child care, and I would suggest to you that their satisfaction with their arrangements regardless of those arrangements suggests that they are finding the quality care that they are seeking.

So looking down the facts of child care, looking at availability, looking at affordability and looking at quality, I would say, and I would say this because I am telling you what parents say, that child care is available, it is affordable, and it is of good quality. And in closing, I would like to say one thing. It is not easy for parents to get good child care of affordable child care. There is a problem balancing work and family. It is very difficult for parents.

Ellen Galinsky is right. Most parents say they want to spend more time with their children. I would say that the problem, though, is not the child care market per se. The problem is the tax burden on American families. You have a tax burden that is so high that it basically takes two full-time bread winners to raise a family. That is one of the reasons why it is so difficult for single parents to raise their children in the settings that they want them in.

Let me give just one example of this of what parents want and what parents are saying they want, and how we know the tax burden is very heavy on them. Several studies, one in particular that was conducted for Glamour magazine, showed that 82 percent of working women agreed with the following statement: If I could afford to stay at home with my pre-school age children, I would. Now I am not up here to say that women should or should not stay home with their children. I think that is a decision that only parents can make because only parents know their children. But parents are expressing overwhelmingly a desire to spend more time with their children and more time with their families, and the best thing—and this is for Senator Coats—that the Federal Government can do is to make it easier for parents to make those choices, and the way that you do that is with a big tax cut. And that is it. Thanks.

Senator COATS. Darcy, thank you very much for giving us a good factual look at a difficult question.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Olsen follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DARCY ANN OLSEN

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the committee, colleagues:

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before this committee to address one of the most important questions facing parents today: child care.

I am, or was, in a certain sense, the child that we are discussing today. I was raised by a young, single mother, who worked as a waitress, from the time I was 3-years-old. I was placed in many types of child care settings: institutional day care, family day care, babysitters, and even sibling care with my brother who was but a year older than I. My worst memory is not, perhaps, what one might expect: it was not a feeling of abandonment, as I understood my mother's need to work; it was not an inattentive provider, as my brother was good company; it was the family day care setting in which I was given powdered milk to drink, which was the worst imaginable suffering for me because I just hated powdered milk. All that may be of interest to you, but like the dozens of anecdotes put forward by many in the White House and in the media, my story has very little real significance. What matters today are not 1, 2, or 10 anecdotes, but the hard facts that speak for the millions of children in this country.

Those who study the child care market generally assess it in three ways: We look at availability, affordability, and quality. And what the facts show is that child care in America is available, affordable, and the high quality that parents seek. According to the most comprehensive nationwide survey done on the state of child care, which was co-sponsored by the department of Health and Human Services (National Child Care Survey), 96 percent of all parents said they are satisfied or very satisfied with their current child care arrangements. That satisfaction rate did not vary with the employment status of the mother, the type of care used, family income, the child's age, or race. Let us examine possible reasons for that satisfaction.

In terms of availability, the White House has suggested there is a serious problem. But their stories do not paint the true picture. According to the most comprehensive study done on child care providers in the United States, which was prepared under contract for the U.S. Department of Education (Profile of Child Care Settings), there is roughly a 12 percent vacancy rate in child care centers, a figure that is remarkably similar across regions and urban, suburban, and rural areas. In addition, there are an estimated 1.1 million nonregulated family day care providers, 40 percent of whom say they have room for more children. According to the Profile of Child Care Settings, "The market seems to be working to increase supply as de-

mand expands." That study confirmed the findings an earlier study by the Labor Department and the National Child Care Survey.

It is also important to note that the studies have also shown that any pockets of shortages are a result of regulatory requirements. Let me give you a local example. In the District of Columbia, it is illegal for two families to share a nanny (or a babysitter). Any babysitter or nanny who wishes to care for children from two different families must be regulated as a child development facility, where she would need to meet the same requirements for space, toys, and food preparation as a child care center. We can only guess at this point how much this ridiculous regulation costs families who might benefit from sharing a babysitter. Moreover, most city zoning commissions consider day care a small business and prohibit programs from opening in residential areas. Those prohibitions can extend even to individuals who wish to use their own homes to care for neighborhood children. Those who seek to increase the availability of child care should examine local zoning ordinances to see if they pose a significant barrier to expanding the supply of child care. If so, waivers can be sought to exempt day care facilities from the ordinances.

In terms of affordability, the White House's analysis-by-anecdote would have us believe that good quality child care is available only for the wealthy. Again, the facts tell a different story. Child care fees have not risen more than 5 percent (in real terms) since the late 1970s. More than sixty percent of preschool-aged children are still cared for primarily by their mom, dad, or a relative. Among families who use non-family child care, half pay nothing: only half of all arrangements used for preschoolers while their mothers are working require a cash payment. That is because parents frequently trade services with other parents in the neighborhood. For those who do pay for child care, the average weekly expenditure for families below the poverty level is $60. Families above poverty pay $76. Is that too much or too little? Nine out of ten parents say they would be willing to pay more for their current child care arrangements.

While problems affording child care are not widespread, there is no doubt that some young families struggle to afford child care. There are roughly 1 million children [1,068,00] whose parents are members of the "working poor." Yet, their situation is far from destitute. More than 6 out of 10 of arrangements chosen by working poor families do not require a cash payment. *Thus, roughly 500,000 families are among the "working poor" who pay for child care.* Surely it is difficult for those families to pay for child care. However, their needs should be addressed, to the extent possible, as should the needs of all families: through relieving the tax burden. When that fails, those families should not be dismissed, but their needs can be, and would be, better addressed at the local or state level. Employers, unions, and communities have responded to working parents' demands for affordable child care. For example, more than half of all families report having an employer benefit that helps them manage child care. Those policies have come about without pressure or "tax incentives" from the federal government. Dozens of unions have also established child care programs for their workers, including the United Auto Workers, United Steel Workers, Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union, and the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

For families entering the workforce, the 1996 welfare reform bill increased the amount of funds in the block grant by 70 percent. Many governors have already reported having a surplus of funds. At least 27 states already provide transitional child care based on a sliding scale for between 12 and 24 months for individuals entering the workforce. And at least 20 states plan to appropriate state dollars beyond the amount that they are required to spend to draw on federal funds. Most important, the welfare reform bill stipulates that a state may not reduce or terminate assistance on the basis of a refusal to work if the household includes a single parent and a child under six and child care is unavailable for nearly any reason. That means that there is no danger of parents' being forced to leave their children in inadequate or dangerous settings while they work.

The American Public Welfare Association has concluded that "there is an across-the board effort to ensure the availability of quality child care for all low-income residents, not just those that are transitioning off welfare." There is every reason to believe that the needs of the poor can be met with assistance from the state and private sectors.

The third criterion is quality. Again, the White House paints a picture of parents incapable of judging the quality of child care settings, but the facts tell a different story. Because people are different, parents have more than one way of defining quality. This medley of parental demands manifests itself in a market with a choice of products-parental care, relative care, family day care, church-based care, commercial child care, and educational preschools Some parents see quality as a feature of providers-whether a provider is warm and loving, reliable and experienced. Those

parents often choose relative or family day care. Other parents see quality as linked to educational opportunities, and they are more likely to choose center-based care. However parents define quality, most say it is more important than cost or convenience when selecting child care providers. Parents' high satisfaction rates with their child care arrangements suggests they are finding and using the quality care they seek.

In the end, the whole child care debate may be irrelevant to how children turn out. "Virtually no research has examined the cumulative, long-term effects on children of attending child care arrangements of varying quality as preschoolers," according to the National Research Council. Even in the short term, the National Institutes of Health has found that regardless of how much child care a child receives, its effects are dwarfed by the influence of family. Even if it could be proven that child care is good for most children, every child has unique needs. The best solution to the day care debate is to allow parents to make the decisions that require keeping the unique needs of each child in mind.

The facts show that the child care market per se is healthy. Child care is available, affordable, and of good quality. There is no public demand for a federal child care plan, so why is there so much talk about child care? According to Rep. George Miller (D-Calif.), who worked to pass a similar child care proposal ten years ago, the child care movement is pure politics. "The fact is that I spent eight years in getting the child-care bill passed in Congress, and at its zenith, there was never a child-care movement in the country. There was a coalition of child-advocacy groups, and a few large international unions that put up hundreds of thousands of dollars, and we created in the mind of the leadership of Congress that there was a child-care movement-but there was nobody riding me. And not one of my colleagues believed that their election turned on it for a moment. There wasn't a parents' movement."

What appears to be driving this movement is an assumption that parents can't be trusted to protect their children. In fact, First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton suggests that parents don't know what constitutes quality child care. As she puts it, parents often "don't know what is quality. If somebody's nice to them, it doesn't matter that they don't know the difference between caring for a 1-year-old or a 4-year-old." I think any parent has the perfect right to be insulted by that attitude. It didn't take a village of politicians to raise Chelsea, why should it take one to raise your child?

Already state, local, and federal tax dollars pay 40 percent of all child care expenditures in the country. Of course a serious reading of the Constitution would never have allowed that level of intervention in the first place, but that is a lengthy discussion for another day. Certainly though, President Clinton's prescription for a dramatic increase in federal involvement in child care cannot be squared with the notion of a national government whose powers are limited and enumerated by the Constitution.

Parents are not calling for federal day care programs; they are calling for choice. Moms and dads want choice: they want to select the best provider for their children, whether themselves, their family members, or educational learning centers. The best way to restore choice is with a direct tax cut.

Let me give you an example. A poll conducted for Glamour magazine found that 84 percent of women who were employed full or part time agreed with the statement, "If I could afford it, I would rather be at home with my children." That poll result is consistent with several other polls. Polls conducted by the Families and Work Institute show that nearly 7 out of 10 parents report wanting to spend more time with their children. The overwhelming majority of parents, moms and dads alike, say they want to spend more time with their children—they simply can't afford it. In the modern age, in this era when taxes are so high that it often takes two full-time breadwinners to raise a family, those choices have become enormously expensive.

An across-the-board tax rate cut would help all parents, those using parental care and those using day care. For some parents, that would mean more money for a different day care provider, for other parents, probably the majority of parents, that would mean working less and spending more time with their children. We must remember that parents, not politicians, are best equipped to make decisions about child care arrangements—decisions that require keeping the unique needs of each child in mind. If the federal government could do one thing to help all children have the best possible child care, it would be to restore that parental choice by cutting taxes.

ATLANTA JOURNAL
ATLANTA GA
WEDNESDAY SEC C1
JAN 14 1998

CHILD CARE IS NOT THE ISSUE

Give parents what they need: Tax cuts

By Darcy Olsen

Washington — It would, quite literally, be the Nanny State.

President Clinton's $21 billion child-care proposal would expand four federal programs and start five new ones. The administration's claim that this "is not a big-government program" simply doesn't pass the straight-face test.

With sops to big business and unions representing child-care workers, the president's proposal would empty parents' pockets and give their children little in return. The tax credit for businesses isn't intended for employees of Joe's Auto Shop; it's corporate welfare for big businesses that have established child-care programs.

The truth about child care is that it is both widespread and affordable. That may be why 96 percent of parents in America, in a study co-sponsored by the Department of Health and Human Services, reported that they are satisfied with their current child-care arrangements.

Many families pay nothing for child care. In 1993, half of all arrangements for preschoolers with working mothers did not require a cash payment. The average weekly expenditure of employed mothers who have incomes below the poverty level and pay for child care for preschoolers is $50. Mothers above poverty pay $76.

Affordable child care is not scarce. In fact, in 1990 there was roughly a 12 percent vacancy rate in child-care centers, a figure that was remarkably similar across regions and urban, suburban and rural areas. That estimate does not include the nearly 1.1 million nonregulated family day-care providers, 40 percent of whom say they have room for more children. More than half of all families report having some employer benefit or policy that helps them manage child-care responsibilities.

Affordable child care is not scarce. In fact, in 1990 there was roughly a 12 percent vacancy rate in child-care centers, a figure that was similar across regions and urban, suburban and rural areas.

What drives the Clinton child care proposals? The assumption that parents can't be trusted because they are just too ignorant and too incapable of caring properly for their children. According to first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton, parents don't know what constitutes quality child care. As she puts it, parents often "don't know what is quality. If somebody's nice to them, it doesn't matter that they don't know the difference between caring for a 1-year-old or a 4-year-old."

Parents do know what quality care is, and they take great pains to find it for their precious children. However they define quality, the vast majority of parents say it is more important than either cost or convenience when selecting child-care providers.

The Clinton administration is pushing ahead with its child-care initiative despite the absence of any scientific data about its impact on young lives. Even in the short term, the National Institutes of Health has found that regardless of how much child care a child receives, its effects are swamped by the influence of family. One thing is clear: There is no consensus, scientific or political, on what is best for every child.

The White House would like to frame the debate over this proposal by asking whether you're for or against children, but that's an absurd question. We're all for children. The real question is: Is on Earth would anyone seriously propose helping children by throwing another $22 billion at businesses and special-interest groups?

The real crisis isn't in child care. It is the enormous tax burden that in so many cases forces both parents to work simply to have the purchasing power that one income used to provide. If the president sincerely wanted to help moms, dads and their children, he could do that in one easy step: He could cut their taxes.

Darcy Olsen is an entitlements policy analyst at the Cato Institute.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Senator COATS. Our next speaker presenter is Danielle Crittenden. She is editor of The Women's Quarterly, which she founded in 1994 with its sponsor, The Independent Women's Forum. Danielle is a frequent guest on national television and radio programs to discuss women's issues and is currently working on a book about women to be published this year by Simon & Schuster. Danielle, we are pleased to have you with us.

Ms. CRITTENDEN. I am going to take the more reactionary view in this discussion. Let us begin by saying every working mother knows the feeling. The pain of saying good-bye to small children early in the morning, the worry for them throughout the day, the nagging guilt that you are not doing the best thing for them, the exhaustion of leading two full-time lives, one as worker, the other as mother. Perhaps this explains why, as Darcy and others have pointed out, that the majority of working mothers say they would rather stay home or work part time than work full time. Not only that. A recent poll showed that a majority of both women and men feel that it is a step in the wrong direction for mothers of small children to work outside the home.

Unfortunately, the politicians with our host today excused who say they want to help working mothers are deaf to what working mothers actually want. Instead, they listen to day care advocates and feminist groups who insist that women need and want more time away from their children and not less. Today I would like to stand back and challenge that presumption because that presumption affects what Senator Coats earlier said is the cultural message to women. When you think about it, it is strange that in all the public discussions of the problems faced by working mothers, the most animating aspect of motherhood, that we love our children more than anything else and want to be with them as much as we possibly can, goes unmentioned. This is not because it is an obvious fact of nature that everyone takes for granted. Rather it is a fact that is now too explosive to confront.

For more than 30 years, the women's movement has told us that we would be happier, more fulfilled human beings if we left our homes and children and went out to work. We have been urged to put our work ahead of our families or at the very least attempt to balance the demands of boss and baby. And in this, the women's movement has been spectacularly persuasive. The mother who does not work outside her home has become a social and statistical novel. Day care advocates like to point out that 60 percent of mothers of pre-school children now work for wages. My generation was raised to believe that by providing for our children's physical and material needs, we could compensate for the maternal comfort they lost by having us at work. Just so long as they were in quote "good care" or quality care, we were told, we would not have to worry about compromising our career.

But this has proven to be a chimera. No amount of Fisher-Price gee gaws and cheerfully painted walls and chirping, brisk day-care workers trained in sensitivity can replace a mother's love and attention. Nor can putting our children in these surroundings ease our maternal fears for their well-being and our aching longing for their company. In all the breaking down of barriers women have

done over a generation, this last remaining barrier, our love for our children, is a stubborn one we haven't been able to push through.

A friend of mine once we told me about a Christmas Eve she spent at work writing a newsletter her boss insisted she get finished that night. She said it nearly broke her heart thinking about her two little kids waiting for her to come home while she labored like some modern day female Bob Cratchit over the cheerless jargon of a routine corporate report. The report, of course, was forgotten by the next week, but her children to this day remember the Christmas Eve their mother did not come home.

When Brenda Barnes, one of the highest ranking female executives in the United States, resigned from her job as CEO of Pepsi Cola North America last fall, she had come to a similar conclusion about the effect of her work on her kids. She made the decision, she told the press, when one of her children said to her it would be okay to keep working if she could quote "promise to be at home for all our birthdays." So it is with some defensiveness that the same advocates who promised that work would be a panacea for women now claim that if it is not, the blame belongs to a society unwilling to provide adequate child care.

If we had government-funded, high quality day care, they say, women would no longer be thwarted by the demands of their children and could fully realize their potential as citizens and workers. It does not seem to matter that parents have shown a marked aversion to this sort of institutional day care these advocates wish to foist upon them. 82 percent of children under 4 today are cared for primarily by a family member, 72 percent by parents, and the remaining ten percent by relatives.

Nor does it seem to matter that a careful reading of the very sketchy research that has been done on children placed in this sort of care leaves in place the common sense conclusion that nonfamily care of very young children tends to be damaging, as we heard this morning or earlier this afternoon. Sorry. The call for universal child care has become a mantra among women's groups, a cure-all, and the yardstick by which they judge any politician's commitment to women's equality.

Yet I think the Department of Health and Human Services could announce tomorrow that it is creating a system of completely free day care centers, each one headed by a newly cloned Mary Poppins, and the problem would not go away. For despite all the reassurances to the contrary, the woman who kisses her child's forehead each morning before going to work still harbors the agonizing suspicion that what her child needs most is her. Feminists react angrily to this sentiment. Mothers should not always have to be the ones to sacrifice their work for their children. It is disturbingly sexist to say that women are quote "better" at caring for infants or more suited to it than men. And anyway, feminists argue, the issue is moot because even if most women wanted to, they could not afford to stay home with their kids and it is elitist to suggest that they should.

But the question we should be asking is why in the space of a generation have we come to consider taking care of your own kids, even if it is just for the few short years before they are in school, as a perk of the rich like yachting? This was not true even in the

depths of the Great Depression. It is true that working and middle class women have always done work of some kind. I do it myself, whether it was voluntary or part time or from their homes. But it is odd that in the richest period ever in our history, we should suddenly be considering a massive Federal program to care for infants because the majority of mothers feel they have quote-unquote "no choice but to work."

Part of the reason for that perception of lack of choice is the burden of taxes an average family is expected to shoulder today compared to 30 years ago and the penalties in our tax code that make it more costly for one parent to stay home. My generation is also accused, justly I think, of having higher expectations for our standard of living than our parents or grandparents did. But I think the fundamental reason why mothers of small children feel the need to work today when two generations ago they did not is the meltdown of the family. Even before a modern woman becomes a mother, even before she marries, she expects that she will have to support herself. All around her are the vast new numbers of single mothers for whom remaining in the workforce is an act of economic necessity. The greater prospect of divorce for a woman today, the fear of having to fend for herself and her children at some point, underlies why even happily married women often feel obliged to work, even when there is no immediate financial reason for them to do so.

Combine the women who must work because they are single mothers and the women who feel they should work to protect themselves lest they become single mothers, and you realize that what looks like a child care crisis is really a symptom of America's largest marriage crisis. OK. You may still argue even if we all went back to the traditional marriages of the 1950's—God forbid—women would still want to work. Arlie Hochschild writes of parents who quote "flee the pressures of home for the relief of work." But really what sort of argument is that? No one compels us to have babies. When we do bear them, we have an obligation to care for them, no matter how dull or tiring that may be. The New York animal shelters will not let you adopt a cat or dog if you work full time. Why should our attitude toward children be any less?

The fact is that when children come along, someone has to accommodate them. A woman who has carried the baby around for 9 months inside of her usually finds it natural to do so and often impossible not to. A Roper's poll of women's attitudes toward work, which has been conducted periodically since 1974, finds that a substantial majority of married women—53 percent—would prefer to stay home with their young children if they could, and that this majority has been growing since 1985. This preference, however, is mostly ignored. Labor unions decry Third World factories where workers stitch and assemble with children at their feet, but in the sleek settings of managerial America, this same practice is being hailed as a progressive way to combine motherhood and work. Some companies are opening sick rooms for employees' children staffed by nurses so a parent never had to take a day off to care for a sniffling son or daughter.

Cutting edge day care centers are installing cameras that parents can access on the Internet from the office. Other companies

and organizations allow employees to bring their infants to the offices and are experimenting with breast-feeding on the job. The Visitors Bureau of Lake County, Indiana sent me a press release bragging that it will now permit newborn to 6-month old babies to accompany employees into the office where they may sleep in cribs near their parents. Quote—this is in the press release—"the sound of a Winnie the Pooh music box mixes with the beeps and whistles of faxes and computers," it boasts. The head of the bureau says, "The time and resources saved by having the employee in the office greatly overcomes any loss of time due to limited distraction." Of course, the bureau did not offer any observations on where it expects parents to put their children after those first 6 months.

No one seems to find any of these solutions creepy. But think—what these policies are saying to women is this: you must never ever think about taking five minutes away from the office, not even for a newborn child. And what do these policies say, too, to the children themselves? From their earliest memories, the love they receive, the attention they get, will have been squeezed in around office schedules and ringing phones. Home will be for them the place of emotional upheaval and flashing tempers and food gulped in front of the television. It will be their day care centers that offer them stability, security and people who care that they have learned to stack blocks and mold Play-Doh.

Twenty years ago, psychologists caught up in the intellectual fashions of the moment insisted that divorce not only was fine for children, it was good for them. Kids, they insisted, did better with one parent than two who were unhappily married. Now that the children of that generation have grown up, the data is irrefutable. Divorce, however good it might be for parents, is a disaster for kids. I often have the sense when I hear day-care advocates extolling its benefits that the results of their experiment will prove equally catastrophic when the results are measured a decade or two from now.

And when you think about it, it seems a poor tradeoff for a society: valuing the work a woman does as a data processor or writing legal briefs more than the hours she might have devoted to helping her daughter feel important in the world. It is sad that in the space of a generation, full-time motherhood has sunk from being regarded as a strong, noble and vital task to one that garners pity at best, contempt at worst. Let us remember the average American woman of my generation will live, we hope, 80 years. She will probably work for 40 of those years. But for six or seven or eight of those years, she will be a mother to very young children. Does it make sense for society to attempt to reinvent itself so that she can more conveniently and inexpensively delegate the care of those babies to strangers or would it be better for society to try and figure out a way to help her care of them herself and then return to work when her children are in school or not return, if that is her preference?

It may seem breathtakingly radical to phrase the question this way: to assert that the solution to the work-home dilemma involves imagining ways to help mothers of young children stay home. But if it does seem radical, that only shows how deeply the feminist beliefs about the primacy of work over family have been absorbed. I

would like to think that an enlightened society is not one in which all its economic and cultural forces combine to encourage women to deposit their children in State creches and walk away without a backward glance. What infant children need is their mother. The difficulty that America's children have in getting her attention, the economic risk that America's mothers run if they give their children those few short years of care in infancy, the care they yearn to give, that is America's true child care crisis. And the solution lies not in subsidizing day care to free mom to go to work to pay the taxes to fund day care. The solution lies in identifying ways to aid and protect mothers who want to do society's most important job themselves. Thank you.

Senator COATS. Thank you, Danielle. That was, as you advertised, a provocative presentation and maybe a preview into your book. I do not know what the subject is.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Crittenden follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DANIELLE CRITTENDEN

EVERY WORKING MOTHER knows the feeling. The pain of saying good-bye to small children in the morning. The worry for them throughout the day. The nagging guilt that you're not doing the best thing for them. The exhaustion of leading two full-time lives: one as worker, the other as mother. Perhaps this explains why the vast majority of working mothers say they'd rather stay home or work part-time than work full-time. Not only that, a recent American poll showed that a majority of both men and women feel that it's a step in the wrong direction for mothers of small children to work outside the home.

Unfortunately, the politicians who say they want to help working mothers are deaf to what working mothers actually want. Instead, they listen to day-care advocates and feminist groups who insist that women not only want to work but have to work. And the so-called solutions they put forth rest on this presumption—that women need and want more time away from their children, and not less. But I'd like to stand back for a few moments, and ask where this presumption came from in the first place, and why it's come to inform virtually every policy that is put forth in the name of working women.

As modern women, we are taught to anticipate many things in our lives, with only one big exception. We have been told, from earliest memory, to make something of ourselves, not to compromise our dreams for others, not to rely too much on men and to be prepared to support and fend for ourselves. We may plot every move of our career as carefully and thoughtfully as a cartographer. But the one profound, life-changing act that most of us eventually will make is the one young women today are now least prepared for: the act of having a child. This is why all discussions of what we will do and how we will choose to live our lives invariably circle back to this one problem. Having a baby is an experience that nothing readies you for, and for which you have to rely upon the guidance of others when you do. But the received wisdom of our time has been to be wary of motherhood as of marriage: to "fit it in" to our careers and to "do it when it's convenient," and "not let it define you." The discovery, of course, when we do have babies, is that they in no way "fit in" to any career, they can never be described as "convenient," and motherhood is about as defining an experience as any human being can undergo.

It's strange, then, that in all the public discussions of the problems faced by working mothers, the most animating aspect of motherhood—that we love our children more than anything else, and want to be with them as much as we possibly can—goes unmentioned. This is not because it is an obvious fact of nature that everyone takes for granted. Rather, if you believe even modestly in women's equality, it's a fact that is too explosive to confront. For more than thirty years, the women's movement has told us that we would be happier, more fulfilled human beings if we left our homes and children and went out to work. To the degree that we might feel any misgivings or guilt about leaving our babies to others to raise, we have been assured that such feelings are *unnatural*, imposed upon us by society, and sexist—no more normal for a mother to experience than a father. Instead we've been taught to suppress these worries, and to put our work ahead of our families or at the very least, attempt to "balance" the demands of boss and baby. Any strong rush of maternal feeling, any desire to surrender pieces of our professional selves, is viewed as

a reversion to some stereotype of motherhood the women's movement was supposed to have lectured out of us. The popular books on motherhood being published by feminists today are no less vehement in their assertions than they were a generation ago that being a good mother means taking care of ourselves first and learning to let others needs come second. The so-called "Good Mother," who makes sacrifices for her children, has been "again and again, the means of restricting women's worlds and prohibiting them from engaging equally in the public world of men," writes Diane Ayer, author of *Mother-Infant Bonding: A Scientific Fiction*, in her more recent book *Motherguilt: How Our Culture Blames Mothers For What's Wrong with Society*. (Is it important to mention this great authority on maternal feeling is not a mother?) Not only this, but mothers working outside the home—we hear—is actively better for our children, because it will foster in them a healthy sense of independence.

And in this, the women's movement has been spectacularly persuasive. The mother who does not work outside her home has become a social and statistical novelty: daycare advocates point out that sixty percent of mothers of pre-school children now work for wages. For a working mother to admit to wanting to be with her children—or worse, to say she'd rather be with them than at the office—is to question the continuing exhaustive efforts to make women equal to men in the workforce: and not just equal in pay but, as the goal now is, equal in the hours they work, in the titles they hold, in the power they wield, and in the proportion they make up of any given occupation, whether it's firefighting or plumbing. Whenever a news report is broadcast about women's "gains" and "losses" this is the presumption that underlies it: women are seen to have gained equality where they reach statistical parity with men in an area of the workforce, and to have suffered losses if their numbers drop below fifty percent. Yet what goes unremarked is that in order to achieve such equality, all women would have to work all of the time.

That women—and in particular, mothers—might not desire this version of equality is not something those tallying up our success in tidy statistical columns wish to consider. This isn't to say that mothers must entirely abandon their work or careers in order to have children. But it is to say, no matter how much we might pretend or wish it otherwise, that having babies affects and constrains even the most ambitious among us, and affects and constrains us differently from men. Indeed women's tendency to interrupt their careers for their children, or to take less demanding—and thus less lucrative jobs—is the main cause of the notorious pay gap between the sexes. June O'Neil, head of the Congressional Budget Office, in her definitive report on the wage gap, pointed out that women aged 27 to 33 earn 98 percent as much as men of similar education and work experience. It is motherhood—and not discrimination—that depresses women's wages. After they become mothers, O'Neil concludes, the priorities and career paths of women simply change.

So long as we continue to deny this, both publicly and to ourselves, all we do is exacerbate the guilty tension that is felt by every working mother at nearly every moment of her working day. This tension grips her round her leg when she leaves in the morning and hurls itself at her when she comes back through the door in the evening. It places a question mark next to every appointment she jots down in her Daytimer. It's the reason she calls home six times a day—or not at all. Indeed, this maternal tension is now a cliche, a staple part of any magazine feature on the problems of modern women, although it's usually spoken of as mere physical stress, the side-effect of the busy, productive lives we lead—the implication being that if we could only organize ourselves better, or magically squeeze more minutes out of each day, it would go away. But the tension is, as mothers know, not due to a simple shortage of hours. Rather, it's an existential lack of time: a feeling of constantly being pulled between two worlds.

My generation was raised to believe that by providing for our children's physical and material needs, we could compensate the maternal comfort they lost by having us at work. Just so long as they were in "good care," we were told, we wouldn't have to worry about compromising our career. But this has proven to be a chimera: no amount of Fisher-Price gee gaws and cheerfully painted walls and chirping, brisk day-care workers and nannies can replace a mother's love and attention. Nor can putting our children in these surroundings ease our maternal fears for their well-being and our aching longing for their company. In all the breaking down of barriers we've done over a generation, this last remaining barrier—our love for our children—is the stubborn one we haven't been able to push through. A friend of mine once told me about a Christmas Eve she spent at work, writing a newsletter her boss insisted get finished that night. She said it nearly broke her heart thinking about her two little kids waiting for her to come home while she labored like some modern-day female Bob Cratchit over the cheerless jargon of a routine corporate report. (The report, of course, was forgotten by the next week, but her children to this

day remember the Christmas Eve their mother didn't come home). When Brenda Barnes, one of the highest ranking female executives in the United States, resigned from her job as CEO of Pepsi-Cola North America in September, 1997, she'd come to a similar conclusion about the value of her work. She made the decision, she said to the press, when one of her children told her it would be okay to keep working if she could "promise to be at home for all our birthdays."

It's with some defensiveness then that the same advocates who promised that work would be a panacea for women now claim that if it's not, the blame belongs to a society unwilling to provide adequate child care. If we had government-funded, high-quality day care—care that every woman could depend upon no matter what her income—they say, women would no longer be thwarted by the demands of their children and could fully realize their potential as citizens and human beings. It doesn't seem to matter that parents have shown a marked aversion to the sort of institutional day care these advocates wish to foist upon them just 1.8 million of the 10 million children under five whose mothers work are in institutional care (the majority are minded by fathers, grandparents and other relatives). Nor does it seem to matter that a careful reading of the very sketchy research that has been done on children placed in this sort of care leaves in place the common sense conclusion that non-family care of very young children is damaging. As Dr. Diane Fisher, a clinical psychiologist and authority on child development has observed, "No matter how high quality the day-care center is, the children still take their naps in little rows of mats on the floor, children still sit in the corner sucking their thumbs and waiting for mommy." Yet the call for "universal child care" has become a mantra among women's groups, a cure-all, and the yardstick by which they judge any politician's commitment to women's equality.

But while the problem of child care is very real, and often a nightmare, for working mothers, it's not, as I've said, essentially the problem. The Department of Health and Human Services could announce tomorrow that it is creating a system of completely free day-care centers, each one headed by Mary Poppins, and the problem wouldn't go away. For despite all the reassurances to the contrary, the woman who kisses her child's forehead each morning before walking out the door to her office still harbors the agonizing suspicion that what her child needs most is *her*. And the so-called solutions that are constantly being advocated in the name of working mothers—whether it is better child care or family leave acts that allow parents time off to go to the dentist with their kids—merely aggravate the problem because they are based upon the wrong assumption: that a mother wants and needs more help being in the workforce away from her children, not less.

Feminists tend to react angrily to this sentiment. It's odious, they say, to insist that mothers should be the ones who sacrifice their work for their children, and not fathers equally. It's disturbingly sexist to say that women are "better" at caring for infants, or more suited to it, than men. And anyway, feminists argue, the issue is moot, because even if most women wanted to, they couldn't afford to stay home with their kids, and it's elitist to suggest that they should.

But the question we should be asking is why, in the space of a generation, have we come to consider taking care of your own kids—even if it's just for the few short years before they are in school—as a perk of the rich, like yachting? This was not true even in the depths of the Great Depression, until our time, having to put your baby into the arms of the state, or to tote it along to the factory with you, has been considered tragic. It's true that working- and middle-class women have always done work of some kind—whether it was voluntary, or part-time, or from their homes. But it is strange that, in the richest period ever in our history, we should suddenly be considering a massive federal program to care for infants because the majority of mothers feel they have "no choice" but to work.

Part of the reason for that perception of lack of choice, of course, is the burden of taxes an average family is expected to shoulder today compared to thirty years ago, and the penalties in our tax code that make it more costly for one parent to stay home. My generation is also accused—justly I think—for having higher expectations for our standard of living than our parents or grandparents did. But I think the fundamental reason that mothers of small children feel the need to work today, when a generation ago they didn't, is the meltdown of the family. Even before a modern woman becomes a mother, even before she marries, she expects she will have to support herself. All around her are the vast new numbers of single mothers, for whom remaining in the workforce is an act of economic necessity. Nearly one out of three American children is growing up in a home headed by a woman who either never married or is divorced or separated; half of all the children in the United States will live in a single-parent household at some point before the age of 18. The greater prospect of divorce for a woman today, the fear of having to fend for herself and her children at some point, underlies why even happily married women

often feel obliged to work, even when there's no immediate financial reason for them to do so. If a woman could be sure that her husband, the cost of leaving the workforce, even just for a few years, might well be bearable. But today no woman can be sure. So she must make her life choices defensively. Combine the women who must work because they are single mothers and the women who feel they should work to protect themselves lest they become single mothers, and you realize what looks like a child-care crisis is really a symptom of America's larger marriage crisis.

Okay, feminist critics may still argue, even if we all went back to the traditional marriages of the 1950s, women would still *want* to work. That's why those seemingly idyllic marriages broke apart. And that's true, too. But then the question we might want to ask ourselves is how can we arrange our work better around the lives of our children, instead of vice versa. Simply saying that women want to work does not excuse preferring to work after we've brought an infant into the world. Arlie Russell Hochschild wrote her book *Time Bind* about parents who "flee the pressures of home for the relief of work." These working mothers find it more pleasant, less menial, and more fulfilling to be at the office than stuck at home with their infants. But, really, what sort of argument is that? No one compels us to have babies. When we do bear them, we have an obligation to care for them, no matter how dull or tiring that may be. The New York animal shelter will not let you adopt a cat or dog if you work full-time; why should our attitude toward children be any less? Yet the feminist wisdom has been that the child should always be the first obligation a woman drops, even if it's the one most precious to her. She must never let go of any of the ones to do with her work. But if you're going to work and have children, some piece of your life inevitably has to give. As a startled broadcasting consultant quipped to the Wall Street Journal in the wake of the Brenda Barnes' resignation, "What state is our society in that deciding to take care of your kids is headline news?"

All right then, the same feminists may fairly argue, why should it be women who must make the sacrifice, and not men? But this is a question that only makes sense if you believe that there is no innate difference, or importance, between mothers and fathers—that we are, or should be, biologically interchangeable, and our roles as parents androgynous. The fact is, when children come along, someone has to accommodate them. A woman who has carried the baby around for nine months inside of her who finds it natural to do so—and often impossible not to. Some may prefer, for ideological reasons, to switch the job to the man. Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg told a newspaper reporter that she'd readily consented to a flexible schedule for one of her male clerks so he could care for his children while his wife worked at a demanding job as an economist. "This is my dream of the way the world should be," she said. "When fathers take equal responsibility for the care of their children, that's when women will be truly liberated."Except in this instance, the father wasn't taking equal responsibility, he was taking most of the responsibility, as one parent of small children must if the other is going to work fulltime. If a father is willing to do that, well, swell. But in most cases, it's still women who not only adjust or sacrifice their work to their families, as June O'Neil found, but in poll after poll express the desire to do so.

For all the feminist insistence that Ozzie and Harriet are dead, the truth is that women themselves wish to stay home with their children if they possibly can. Only about one-third of the 7.2 million married women with children younger than three work fulltime. A Roper poll of women's attitudes toward work, which has been conducted periodically since 1974, finds that a substantial majority (53 percent to 41 percent) of married women would prefer to stay home with their young children if they could—and that this majority has been growing since 1985.

This makes sense. Work for this generation of women is stripped of the novelty and glamour it held for women of our mother's time, who were entering its vast marble foyers from their cloistered living rooms. Women who can be described as having interesting, fulfilling jobs (like men, for that matter) represent a tiny minority of the workforce. There are about 100,000 female lawyers in America. More than 600,000 women work as receptionists, more than one million work as waitresses and close to two million work as bookkeepers. On the whole, nearly 80 percent of working women earn less than $26,000 per year. These women by and large do not experience the world of work as a liberation from the drudgery of child-rearing. More likely for them it is work that is drudgery, and child-rearing that is liberating. As a male executive told the Wall Street Journal, "The truth is, no one wants to say it or print it, but a lot of these jobs are crap and a lot of these demands are just awful. One day you come in after your latest trip on the red-eye, beat to crap, and you say, I just don't want this stuff anymore."

Even women who do work in careers they find exciting change their minds after they have babies. Creeping into the pages of women's magazines are testimonial fea-

tures by broadcast journalists and investment bankers who were startled by how much they enjoyed being mothers. "Growing up in the slipstream of feminism, my friends and I had definite notions of what we would do when we grew up. We would become pilots, lawyers, actresses, photographers, and tycoons," writes former newspaper correspondent Meghan Cox Gurdon in a 1998 essay. "Never ever, would any of us settle for being just a housewife." But she goes on to say, with some embarrassment, "Reader, I am a housewife. I'm acquainted with scores more. And not one of these women . . . are bored, foolish, or frustrated. None of us is even overweight. Of the two dozen housewives I know best, all but one has at least a bachelor's degree. Most of us left successful, professional careers after our children were born, and most of us are in our thirties. At our coffee mornings—yes! we do sometimes meet for coffee—we talk politics as much as we do infant feeding schedules . . . I ran into a former colleague recently, a radio correspondent who, like me, has lived around the world and reported dangerous and thrilling stories. Her face crinkled with incredulity when I told her of my current goings-on. But what do you do? Ah. This is the great unanswerable question, the one dinner party query that leaves all but the most self-assured housewives gasping like beached tuna."

This question is only unanswerable, however, in a society in which the virtues of work have been so inflated that we can no longer appreciate anything that's not accompanied by a check. When feminists elevated the status of work women did outside the home over what they did inside it, it was hard for mothers to answer back—as it is still hard for them to answer back. The joy mothers take in their children, the satisfaction they feel raising them into useful and decent citizens, are intangibles that cannot be neatly lumped into statistics nor whose proceeds will purchase a sport utility vehicle or some other trapping of worldly success. The rewards of a job are measurable in ways you can convey to other people, particularly those without children: I earn XX amount; I finished this lengthy report; my sales commissions went up XX percent last year. No one gets paid for being a mother—if anything, it's a colossal net loss, and the love you feel for your child, the love you receive back, are utterly untransferable. To onlookers he is just another runny-nosed, dopey-looking, whiny impediment to getting things done. It may be true that thirty years ago, shockingly discriminatory attitudes toward women in the workplace prevailed, and we are all thankful to be rid of them. But in their place has risen some shockingly discriminatory attitudes toward women who wish to have children without neglecting them (exemplified by Hillary Clinton's defensive remark, "I could have stayed home and baked cookies"). And it is these attitudes like these which have make it difficult for a woman today to occupy either sphere of work or home completely happily, without feeling guilty and exhausted in one or insecure and under appreciated in the other.

The so-called "progressive" solutions being advocated are hardly so. Some companies are opening sick rooms for employees children, staffed by nurses, so a parent never has to take a day off to care for a sniffling son or daughter. Instead, they can pull their children from their beds, haul them to work in the car, and deliver them into sick cots under the watch "caring professionals." Cutting-edge day-care centers are installing cameras that parents can access on the Internet from the office. That way they can watch their child playing happily or napping peacefully (the centers hope) after that tearful and upsetting parting scene they had when they dropped their toddlers off. Other companies and organizations allow employees to bring their infants to the offices and are experimenting with breast-feeding on the job. The visitor's bureau of Lake Courity, Indiana, issued a press release bragging that it will now permit newborn to six-month-old babies to accompany employees into the office where they may sleep in cribs near their mothers or fathers. "The sound of a Winnie the Pooh music box mixes with the beeps and whistles of faxes and computers," boasted the release. The head of the bureau extolled the benefits of the new policy: "The time and resources saved by having the employee in the office greatly overcomes any loss of time due to limited distraction." Of course, the bureau didn't offer any observations on where it expects parents to put their children after those first six months.

Labor unions decry Third World factories where workers stitch and assemble with their children at their feet. But in the sleek settings of managerial America, this same practice is being hailed as a progressive way to combine motherhood and work. No one seems to find any of these solutions creepy. But think—what these policies are saying to women is this: You must never, ever think about taking five minutes away from the office, not even for a newborn child. Is he sick? Bring him along and let our nurses care for him. Is he too little to be left alone in day care? Well, put a crib in your office and you can make those calls while breast-feeding! And what do these policies say, too, to the children themselves? From their earliest memories, the love they receive, the attention they get will have been squeezed in

around office schedules and ringing phones. Home will be for them the place of emotional upheaval and flashing tempers and food gulped in front of the television; it will be their day care centers that offer them stability, security, and people who show care that they have learned to stack blocks and mold Play-Doh. Yet as Dr. Robert Goldberg of the George Washington medical center has noted, "[T]here are more children grappling with psychological and social dysfunction . . . than there were before World War II. Rates of depression, cognitive disorders, suicide, teenage pregnancy, criminality, and drug abuse have doubled over the past twenty years. Violent youth crime, in spite of a recent dip, has steadily risen over the past twenty-five years and is now projected to triple over the next decade. Incredible as it may seem, this generation of children, the most technologically and economically blessed in recent times, is the most troubled. And despite a massive increase in the size and number of government programs designed to give children a healthy and head start in life, we have on our hands what amounts to an epidemic of childhood dysfunction." Twenty years ago, psychologists caught up in the intellectual fashions of the moment insisted that divorce not only was fine for children, it was good for them: kids, they insisted, did better with one parent than two who were unhappily married. Now that the children of that generation have grown up, the data is irrefutable: divorce, however good it might be for parents is a disaster for children. I often have the sense when I hear daycare advocates who extol its benefits that the results of their experiment will prove equally catastrophic when the results are measured a decade or two from now.

When you think about it, it seems a poor trade-off for a society: valuing the work a woman does writing legal briefs more than the hours she might have devoted to helping her daughter feel her importance in the world. It is sad that in the space of a generation, full-time motherhood has sunk from being regarded as strong, noble, and vital task, to one that garners pity at best, contempt at worst. Until we acknowledge that not only do children need their mothers, but that mothers need their children, and that this neither bad for women nor a sign of weakness, we will never be equal to men in way that we care about, only, at best, equivalent in our statistical output and our monetary invoices.

It may be that equality for women, true equality for women, will rest in accepting that we can have it all—but that we cannot have it all once. The average American woman of my generation will live eighty years. She will probably work for forty of those years. But for six or seven or eight of those years, she will be a mother to very young children. Does it make sense for society attempting to re-invent itself so that she can more conveniently and inexpenively delegate the care of those babies to strangers? Or would it be better for society to try and figure out a way to help her care for them herself, and then return to work when her children are in school (or not return, if that is her preference)?

It may seem breathtakingly radical to phrase the question this way: to assert that the solution to the work/home dilemma involves imagining ways to help mothers of young children stay home. But if it does seem radical, that only shows how deeply the feminist beliefs about the primacy of work over family, autonomy over motherhood, have been absorbed. I'd like to think that an enlightened society is not one in which all its economic and cultural forces combine to encourage women to deposit their children in state creches and walk away without a backward glance. And if I'm right, then any solution *must* begin with the recognition that women need help getting time *away* from the workforce to be with their young children; and not, as the current advocates would have it, in subsidizing day care to free Mom to go to work to pay the taxes to fund day care.

To this end, there are a few things government policy could do to help women. First would be to help women feel more economically secure in their marriages, and thus more secure about taking time out from their work. That would mean correcting some of the distorting incentives of the tax code that penalize families in which one parent doesn't work. It might also mean for states to revive the old concept of alimony in divorce law for the benefit of at-home mothers. When a twenty-five-year-old woman leaves the workforce for eight years to rear her children, she loses more than simply eight years of income: She virtually guarantees that her income at age forty will drop below what it would have been if she'd remained at work. If she makes that sacrifice, she is relying on her husband's fidelity. And that reliance should be protected, just as it would be in any other contract. The well-being of the next generation of Americans depends upon that contract's being honored, and we therefore have an interest in seeing that it is. And if for some reason it is not—if that marriage ends in divorce—the wife's husband should owe her more than just child support till the kids reach eighteen: He should owe her a continuing claim upon his future income, in recognition of the benefit he derived from her work raising the children. (There's actually evidence that the husband of at-home women

earn higher incomes than the husbands of wworking women: the Jenkins-can-you-get-on-the-next-plane-to-Cincinnati effect. If soo, that strengthens even further the at-home wife's claim on her husband's future inncome).

But government policy, in the end, can onnly do so much. Ultimately, any solution will rely upon changing the attitudes of wwomen themselves. So long as we insist upon defining our identities only in terms of our work, so long as we try to shove the needs of our children and our own feelinngs for them under the rug, we will continue to feel torn, dissatisfied, and exhausteed. Is this unfair? Probably. But it is an issue to take up with nature, not politicianss. We are the most radically equal generation of women in human history and we hhave collided with one of the oldest facts of our sex. There may be ways to ease our situation, but we cannot change it. Nor should we want it to be changed. The guiltt we feel for neglecting our children is a by-product of our love for them. It keeps us from straying too far from them, for too long. Their cry should be more compellingg than the call from the office.

Senator COATS. Our last presenteer is Anita Blair. Anita is Executive Vice President and General Counsel for the Independent Women's Forum, which is dedicated to reesearch and public education on policy issues related to women. Shhe is frequently called upon to offer perspective on issues ranging from affirmative action, gender issues, women in business, women in the military and many others. She is a practicing attorney aand was appointed by Governor George Allen of Virginia to serve oon the Board of Visitors of Virginia Military Institute. We welcomee you, Anita.

Ms. BLAIR. Thank you very much, Senator. I will take the prerogative as the last presenter to thanhk you, Senator Coats, and your staff of your subcommittee, Chairmman Jeffords, and the members who have joined us here this afterrnoon for this, at least for me, very enlightening and provocative afternoon. I will also take the prerogative as the last speaker to remind us of where we were a couple of hours ago. Among the verry first words that were spoken this afternoon were that we are herre to talk about the children and the families of America. And the vast majority of those children and those families are essentially healthy. They are essentially in a situation where they can take carre of themselves and they want to take care of themselves, and when we talk about children, we need to remember that we need to protect the interest of the vast majority of children and families att the same time as we consider what is going to be best and most helpful for the other families, the families in the minority, that because of poverty or because of psychological or physical problems meed some extra help, but let us not let our eye off the ball of the great majority of children and families.

And speaking of majorities, there have been several polls in recent years that have asked what people, especially women, really want in terms of balancing the demands of work and family. And the answers that women and people generally give are these. They say I would rather not have to work outside the home. They said I would rather not have to spend so many hours at my job. I would rather have a more flexible work schedule, and some say I would rather be my own boss and manage my time the way I want to. Well, why not? What is so difficult about achieving these simple wishes? Why cannot people just do what they want to do? Well, often it would violate Federal and State laws. When you examine the reasons why families cannot achieve their wishes, one thing quickly becomes apparent: for the most part, what families really want and need is not to be covered by new government programs but instead to get free of old government regulations.

Now, there are no laws that say mothers must work or parents must work overtime whenever possible. But there are laws that say families must pay a very large portion of their earnings out in taxes. And employers must incur substantial added expense when they offer flexible work conditions to their employees. And there are plenty of laws that say, in effect, if you are thinking of owning your own business, being your own boss, beware. Too often in the past, Congress has acted in various areas, tax laws, labor laws, health and safety regulations, other business regulations, without fully considering the impact on families.

I have practiced law for over 15 years, and in that time I have worked with literally hundreds of businesses. The majority, in fact, have been small family-owned and operated businesses. Here are examples of the kind of legal problems they face everyday. But as you will see, these stories start out as life problems, little dilemmas faced by people who want to try to make a living and have a life. One scenario: a proud mom would like to take a few hours off on the occasional Friday afternoon to watch her child play sports. She would like to make up the time at work the following week. Sorry says her boss, you will have to take annual leave. What is the problem? Federal wage and hour laws require her boss to dock her pay the short week and pay her overtime the following week when she works extra hours. Interestingly, if she worked for the Federal Government, she would have flex-time and comp-time privileges, but flex-time and comp-time for other workers still is against the law. Simply allowing employers and employees to make mutual agreements about work hours would be a great boon to parents who want to manage their work and family obligations.

Another common scenario: A mother who is a cashier in a store gets requests from her manager to work overtime all the time. She wants to be a team player but she also wants to go home to her family. She wonders, surely, it is cheaper to hire more people than to pay me overtime. Well, it is not. The high cost of payroll taxes, unemployment tax, workers compensation, and other mandatory benefits makes it very expensive to hire additional people, even if they only work part time. As a result, small businesses cannot grow. Existing employees are asked to work more hours and potential new employees cannot get work. If Congress would reduce these payroll taxes on employment, businesses could hire more workers and overworked people could get their lives back.

Another scenario, very common in my practice: After the birth of her second child, a young mother decides that is it; I want to be home with my kids now. So she plans to operate a consulting business from her home which will allow her to work the hours she chooses. Is she home free? Not hardly. She will probably need an accountant and a lawyer to help her navigate the tricky tax problems she will face as an independent contractor taking deductions for a home office and home office equipment. These restrictions have been eased a little bit in recent years, but it is still way too complicated for normal people who just want a little income while they stay home with their kids. The tax code should be drastically simplified, especially for micro-businesses like this.

Many mothers work outside the home not because they are pursuing a professional career or because they love to work but be-

cause it is necessary in order for the family to have health insurance or to pay college and educational expenses. Even though portability of health insurance has been improved in recent years, many people are still tied to their current employer's health insurance plan. There is simply no logical reason why individuals and families should not be able to buy their own insurance and get a tax deduction for it. This would free them to take jobs that suit them best and it would have the added benefit of reducing medical and insurance costs by introducing competition in the system with all of these new purchasers looking for the best deal.

School costs, especially college, are just too high, and it is a shame to see young college graduates saddled with huge debts before they have even started their careers. As a trustee of a college, I know that colleges and universities spend a huge amount of their budgets just complying with Federal regulations. Also, State and local school systems are burdened with costs of Federal compliance. If the Federal Government would ease up on expensive regulation and recordkeeping requirements, maybe schools across the country could focus once again on providing a good education at a reasonable price rather than providing lots of reports to Washington. This would help families.

There is a lot that people can do which will really meet their individual needs if they are allowed to work it out for themselves. For example, people who want more family time can benefit from job sharing, leave sharing, telecommuting arrangements, which would let them spend less time on work, more time on their families. Most employers are not like Scrooge. They are people, too, and have families of their own. Many businesses, large and small, are eager to accommodate the family needs of their employees, but they face many hurdles in complying with complicated laws as they do so. And the reach of Federal laws into every single aspect of employing people and running a business means employers must incur the costs of legal review any time they are thinking of adopting a new idea to help their people.

The difficulties faced by parents and families today center around having not enough time and not enough money. To a large degree, their money goes to government and their time goes to working longer hours so they can live on the share of the income they get to keep. The best thing the Federal Government could do is let families take care of themselves by reducing the tax burden on them and allowing them to choose flexible work arrangements including self-employment. Legislation about taxes and business regulations comes up every single day in Congress. It is important for Congress to understand that these laws are going to affect not only businesses and taxpayers but parents, children and families, too. Tolstoy said all happy families are the same. That is not true. All families, happy, sad, rich, poor, are different. They deserve the chance to thrive, to seek happiness on their own terms and not be forced into vast uniform Federal programs. One size does not and cannot fit all.

Senator COATS. Anita, thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Blair follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ANITA K. BLAIR

Several polls have asked what people, especially women, really want in terms of balancing the demands of family and work.

The answers they give are basically these:

"I'd rather not have to work outside the home."

"I'd rather not have to spend so many hours at my job."

"I'd rather have a more flexible work schedule."

"I'd rather be my own boss and manage my time the way I want to."

Well, why not? What is so difficult about achieving these simple wishes? Why can't people just do what they want to do?

One major reason is that often it would violate federal and state laws. When you examine the reasons why families can't achieve their wishes, one thing quickly becomes apparent: For the most part, what families really want and need is not to be covered by new government programs but instead to get out from under old government regulations.

Now, there are 110 laws that say "Mothers must work" or "Parents must work overtime whenever possible."

But there are laws that say, "Families must pay a very large portion of their earnings out in taxes" and "Employers must incur substantial added expense when they offer flexible work conditions to employees."

And there are plenty of laws that say, in effect, "If you're thinking of owning your own business, BEWARE."

Too often in the past, Congress has acted in various areas-tax laws, labor laws, health and safety regulations, other business regulations- without fully considering the impact on families.

I have practiced law for over fifteen years, and in that time I've worked with hundreds of businesses, big and small. The majority, in fact, have been small, family-owned and operated businesses. Here are examples of the kind of legal problems they face every day. As you'll see, these stories start out as life problems-little dilemmas faced by people trying to make a living and have a life.

A proud mom would like to take a few hours off on occasional Friday afternoons to see her child play sports. She'd like to make up the time at work the following week. "Sorry," says her boss. "You'll have to take annual leave." What's the problem? Federal wage and hour laws require her boss to dock her pay for the short week and pay her overtime if she works extra hours the following week. Interestingly if she worked for the federal government she'd have flex-time and comp-time privileges. But flex-time and comp-time for other workers still is against the law. Simply allowing employers and employees to make mutual agreements about work hours would be a great boon to parents who want to manage their work and family obligations.

A mother who is a cashier in a store gets requests from her manager to work overtime all the time. She wants to be a team player, but she also wants to get home to her family. She wonders, "Surely it's cheaper to hire more people than to pay me all this overtime?" Well, it isn't. The high cost of payroll taxes, unemployment tax, workers compensation and other mandatory benefits makes it very expensive to hire additional people, especially if they only work part-time. As a result small businesses can't grow, existing employees are asked to work more hours, and potential new employees can't get work. If Congress would reduce these taxes on employment, businesses could hire more workers, and overworked people could get their lives back.

After the birth of her second child, a young mother decides, "That's it. I want to be home with my kids." So she plans to operate a consulting business from home, allowing her to work the hours she chooses. Is she home free? Hardly. She'll probably need an accountant and a lawyer to help her navigate the tricky tax problems she'll face as an independent contractor taking deductions for a home office and equipment. These restrictions have been eased a little bit, but it's still way too complicated for normal people who just want a little income while they stay home with their kids. The tax code should be drastically simplified, especially for micro-businesses like this.

Many mothers work outside the home, not because they're pursuing a professional career or because they love to work, but because it's necessary in order for the family to have health insurance or pay college and educational expenses.

Even though portability of health insurance has been improved in recent years, many people are still tied to their current employer's health insurance plan. There is simply no good reason why individuals and families shouldn't be able to buy their own insurance and get a tax deduction for it. This would free them to take jobs that

suit them best, and it would have the added benefit of reducing medical and insurance costs, by introducing competition into the system.

School costs, especially college, are just too high. And it's a shame to see young college graduates saddled with huge debts before they've even started their careers. As a trustee of a college, I know that colleges and universities spend a huge amount of their budgets just complying with federal regulations. Also state and local school systems are burdened with costs of federal compliance. If the federal government would ease up on expensive regulations and recordkeeping requirements, maybe schools across America could focus once again on providing a good education rather than lots of reports to Washington. This would help families.

There is a lot that people can do, which will really meet their individual needs, if they are allowed to work it out for themselves. For example, people who want more family time can benefit from job-sharing and telecommuting arrangements, which would let them spend less time on work. Most employers are not like Scrooge. They are people, too, and have families of their own. Many businesses, large and small, are eager to accommodate the family needs of their employees. But they face many hurdles in complying with complicated laws as they do it. And the reach of federal laws into every single aspect of employing people and running a business means employers must incur the cost of legal review anytime they're thinking of adopting a new idea to help their people.

The difficulties faced by parents and families today center around having not enough time and not enough money. To a large degree, their money goes to government, and their time goes to working longer hours so they live on the share of their income they get to keep.

The best thing the federal government can do is let families take care of themselves by reducing tax the burden on them and allowing them to choose flexible work arrangements, including self-employment. Legislation about taxes and business regulations comes up every single day in Congress. It's most important for Congress to understand that these laws are going to affect not only businesses and taxpayers, but parents, children and families, too.

Senator COATS. That concludes our presenters for the second portion of the symposium. We have four respondents. Let me just very briefly introduce them. Heidi Brennan is Public Policy Director for Mothers at Home, a frequent author on family issues, and a prominent speaker to mothers' groups around the country.

Charmaine Yoest is co-author of the book Mother in the Middle, an examination of the devaluing of motherhood, the child care issue and the work-family dilemma for women. She is a Bradley Fellow at the University of Virginia and an Adjunct Fellow for the Family Research Council.

Robert Rector, a veteran in child care debates, is Senior Policy Analyst for Family and Welfare Issues at the Heritage Foundation and in the late 1980's played a very major role in the child care debate then before the Congress.

And Michael Lotito is a member of the Board of Directors for the Society of Resource Management, the world's largest human resource organization, with 93,000 other professional members from around the country and around the world. He is a highly regarded employment expert, speaker and author, and certified as a Senior Professional in Human Resources. We appreciate the presence of our respondents, and I would turn to them first to get their reactions to the presentations that were made and then open it up for a back and forth discussion with our presenters.

First, though, let me acknowledge the presence of my colleague, Senator Chafee from Rhode Island, who has joined us and who has been instrumental as a member of the Finance Committee in focusing on among other things child care policies, tax policies as they affect families, children, working mothers, and others, and Senator Chafee, we are very pleased to have you with us. If there is any-

thing you would like to comment on before I turn to the respondents, the microphone is yours.

Senator Chafee. No, Senator. I just want to express my thanks for what you are doing in assembling this very prestigious group here, and I regret that because of schedule conflicts that I could not be here and cannot stay the whole time perhaps, but I am going to read your transcript and am very interested in what you have accomplished.

Senator COATS. Well, we appreciate your being here. We had a very interesting and I think important discussion in the first panel on the question of what children need. We had child care and child development experts and psychologists and others from around the country that gave us some very valuable insights, and we now have turned to the question of what parents want. So with those two questions, we are attempting to lay the foundation for some factual basis and some philosophical basis for how we proceed with this child care debate. Let me now turn to the respondents and take their responses to the presentations. We will start with you.

Ms. Brennan. I want to thank you, Senator. I would first like to say that for 14 years Mothers at Home, which I would like to introduce to the audience, has heard from mothers across the country. And I would say during that time—I have been a mother for 14 years—I joined the organization when I had a baby, and I have been watching the debate about family life, about child care, about motherhood since that time in May of 1984. One of the things that we talked about today, we heard people say, we do not want a one-size-fits-all solution. And certainly looking at the diversity of families and certainly mothers that we have heard from over the years, I would agree.

But I want to tell you that I have only heard one-size-fits-all for the last 14 years as a mother and as a member of my organization, and that one-size-fits-all has been that what families want is child care. This is the first time in my memory that a representative from an at-home mothers' organization has been invited to participate in a serious discussion at an symposium other than on two occasions to hearings in Congress about tax credits. And so I thank you for this historic opportunity. I know that the White House thought it was important that they have a discussion of child care in the White House and that was historic. I think it is more historic when we finally acknowledge the work of at-home parents in this kind of forum.

I also think it is important it was mentioned we do not want to turn this into a kind of dichotomy: the good day care/the bad day care. I do not think we have really ever discussed what is in between, and that is one of the things I want to present today and ask our panelists about. But I would like to also say something about decision-making. We talked about giving parents choices, about making it possible for them to choose. And I want to tell you about decision-making that goes on in the life of a parent, particularly a mother who I represent. What happens is this generation of American mothers is the best educated, the most career accomplished. And we go to school and we learn that the most important thing that we can do in our lives is what we achieve in our careers, and then we get married, we start families, and we are led to be-

lieve that the only fulfillment we are going to find is to continue that level of career commitment in the workforce. And so women go into parenthood unprepared for the decision-making they are about to encounter as they receive this child, whether it is through birth or through adoption.

What they find is that what they thought would be easy, to turn this child over full time to a caregiver, a warm, sensitive caregiver, is not exactly what they had in mind because what is warm and sensitive to a mother is somewhat different than what is warm and sensitive to a social worker. I have often joked that someone coming to my home might not be impressed that I let my children play with bubbles at the sink for an hour. It does not look as interesting and stimulating as Fisher-Price toys, but yet that is the kind of things that mothers do.

So this population unprepared for the economic changes in the family, the fact that perhaps they could afford a one-parent home or one parent home part-time, cannot afford it at that point, and the population that we hear from is 50 percent women who at some point make the decision to go home after several months/several years of trying to rearrange their family's finances or through creating a work-at-home option. It is a feeling that has also not supported what that mother feels because her society around her tells her to deny your feelings. In fact, today, the chirpy literature you can find in most common women's magazines is if you feel bad about leaving your child in child care just get a manicure. That will take care of it, and I defy you—you go find a magazine on the stands today that would suggest that, that or a nice workout or makeover would take care of your feelings. I think it is remarkable that we are addressing children's feelings with such depth and sensitivity today and we do not address the feelings of women in this country.

This is also a large group of women going through this process. I know that at-home mothers are portrayed as the Ozzie and Harriett, the cooked statistic, three percent of American families are traditional families with a stay-at-home mother, and yet 60 percent of all families of young children or actually children under the age of 18 either have an at-home mother full time, not employed, or they have a part-time working mother. One of the interesting things our organization learned is that part-time mothers identify with at-home mothers. They see the arrangement they made in their lives as one that supports their commitment to their family and the kind of care they think their children need.

There has been a mommy wars, but it is not the one that you think. It is a mommy wars that has been the persistent literature in the child care advocacy movement to marginalize at-home mothers and to not include them in this discussion and not to look at decisions about child care funding, about many kinds of solutions that are being discussed in terms of what is their impact, but I can tell you that from letters and e-mails that I have received, not only in the past 6 months but over the years, that mothers are desperately afraid that solutions for the child care crisis, as it is called, will force them into the workforce. And I think it is important that any decision-making, any discussion we have on policy,

must continue to include at-home parents, and I add that because there are approximately two million stay-at-home fathers as well.

What I would like to do is at some point ask the panel to address the question of how do we get to the kinds of options that allow parents to pull back? One of the things that a really interesting book was written several years ago by Arlene Cardoza Rosen called Sequencing, and it was about choosing to be at home for a period of time, and it can also been seen as sort of a downsizing choice, downsizing the role that work has in your life for both mothers and fathers to allow them to be more available to their children, and yet in every discussion of family friendly work benefits, I have never seen anything about downsizing that period of work including such possibilities as having a rehire program for at-home mothers to come back into the workforce where their value is not simply what their job was before, but their value is seen as the maturing aspects that motherhood has provided them because I think that while we talked about how children go through developmental milestones, certainly parents do. And when parents do not have enough time to engage in parenthood, they skip those milestones and end up having to later recover some of their learning through the help of others, mentors or others in their community.

So I think when we do not allow parents to spend time with children, we do not allow them to grow as parents so that they can handle the emotional nuances and the relationships as they are tested later on in their lives, and as a mother of a teenager I can tell you that you have to be prepared for each stage by going through the first stage previous to it. So I would like to hear some discussion about how we can move beyond some of the things that were said about part-time, flexible, what have you, to look at and to recognize at-home as a stage, but also to sort of encourage a flexibility in that whole career plan. Thank you.

Senator COATS. Thank you. Thank you. Anyone else, any other respondents? Yes.

Ms. YOEST. I would like to start out by addressing this issue of low-income families because I think that there does seem to be developing a real dichotomy between people thinking, well, you have got these at-home parents over here who can afford to do so and the low income families that we as the government need to reach out and help, and I think that we would—I do not think there is anybody in this room who is hardhearted enough not to feel something when Helen Blank recounts a story of a woman who is struggling with child care. I think everybody here has an instinctive reaction to that, but I think we have to also be guided by the reality of what you can do within the limits of public policy. And I think we have to be careful, too, about some of the misconceptions we have about low-income families.

One of the things that I would like to underscore for us is that among low-income families with pre-school children whose mothers are working, more of those children are cared for by their fathers than are cared for in day care centers. Only 17.3 percent of children who are classified as children of low-income mothers utilize commercial care for their children. I think this is really important because this seems to me one of the most elitist responses to this problem is to say that the government is going to come in and em-

phasize commercial care for low-income children when in actual fact there are an equal number of them being cared for by their fathers. Why should we not start a Federal program to support father care of children? I think that might be a better idea.

To put a fine point on that, 52.3 percent of low-income children are cared for by a family member. Ellen says that many of these family members do not want to be caring for those children. I think that we would want to be really careful about those kind of statistics. Wanting to and being willing to obviously are two different things, and sometimes we do things we do not want to because it is the best thing for the children, and I think again as public policy makers we should not be coming in and saying that a choice that a low-income family has made is not a good one and that they would be better off in a center.

Another thing I would like to underscore the point that the largest group of people in America who have at-home moms are in the demographic group their families make 20,000 to $24,999 a year. These are not wealthy people. These are people who have made huge sacrifices to have one parent home with their children, and for us to continue to have the idea in our minds that those people are wealthy and that they are not in need in support is really, really damaging from public policy standpoint. If we continue to enact policy incentives that go against, if we are continuing to say that those people's tax dollars are going to support this Federal child care initiative, I do not think that most Americans would be supportive of that kind of thing if they knew that that is what was actually happening.

Additionally, the President when he announced his child care initiative said that this was an historic initiative, and there was somehow the implication that nothing was being done up to this point about child care. The GAO, the General Accounting Offices, has done research for Congress, and they found 90 Federal programs that have something to do with child care, 90 programs. We are already doing a lot, not to say that there are not people out there who are struggling with child care, but I am saying that there is not a dearth of activity on the Federal level for child care programs.

Second, I want to address this issue of quality because we were saying that there was an agreement about quality, and I think that is true to a certain degree, but I think where we start to diverge is in agreement about how that quality can be delivered and who can do it. I would like to challenge the assumption that is made that quality can necessarily be bought with Federal dollars. I am the mother of three children under the age of five and my youngest baby was amazingly colicky when she was born, and so the only way that we could cope with the situation was to put her in a snugly because that is the only way she was happy, and the only way for me to maintain my sanity was then to get out of the house. So I would load my two older children up in a walker, and I had them in a walker and the baby in the snugly, and with I am imagining a very fatigued look on my face, I would then go out and walk and go places, and it was very funny because I would continue to run into people and they would do this double-take and they would go, wow, you have got your hands full, and I would kind of go yeah.

Well, I still continue—now that my baby is a real cheerful and happy little girl, I still continue to get this reaction any time I go anywhere with them. I hear that all the time, wow, you have got your hands full. Why am I telling you this? Because the standards for child care that define high quality care from the National Association of the Education of Young Children, which we have shortened to NAEYC, is that if you have high quality care, you will have one caregiver for four infants. I am not sure that we would necessarily agree that your infant is going to get the highest quality care with four. I think of that every time I see the media coverage of the McCaughey family because I think, you know, the NAEYC standards for 3-year olds say one caregiver for every seven 3-olds, and I think I wonder if people looking at the McCaughey family when they get to be three would think that Mrs. McCaughey was not going to need a lot of help everyday. In fact, I saw an article the other day that said that her whole community is massing around here to make sure that she is going to have a lot of help because everybody recognizes that all day everyday with that many kids is a pretty big job. So we recognize that in terms of a biological mother, but then we are surprised that there is this astronomical turnover in day care centers when we expect an unrelated person to care that this baby, that if she has got four babies to care for and the baby is screaming, to me I think we are setting ourselves up for failure if we think that that is going to work.

Oh, and I should also mention that they have done studies of the staff-to-infant ratio, and they find that in the industry, one for four just very rarely happens. What they found is when a center is not meeting those standards, on average they have twice as many children in their care. So in terms of the quality issue, you know, you have got an awful lot of day care centers out there where they are caring for a lot more children than one to four.

Briefly, let me just mention—there are so many little points to hit here—children in day care centers are 18 times more likely to be ill than children who are cared for at home. At any one time in day care centers in America, 16 percent of the children are sick. They are being sent to day care centers ill, and I think as a matter of public policy, we have to take this into consideration as well, that that is going to incur a higher cost as well societally from ill children.

Last, not last in general, but last as it relates to quality, I want to give a quote from Dr. Belsky. I hope you do not mind. In terms of quality, Darcy makes a good point in that not all children who go to day care centers turn out badly. Many of them turn out to be as wonderful as Darcy, but I think that one of the reasons that mothers and fathers feel so conflicted about day care is that they understand a tradeoff that Dr. Belsky wrote about in a review of the day care literature back in 1990. He was quoting a study that was looking at the issue of quality and what constituted quality and what constituted good results amongst children in day care centers, and what Dr. Belsky's summation of that research was was him saying that one consequence of extensive nonparental care initiated in the first year is that the influence parents would otherwise exert on their children is quote-unquote "lost to or at least assumed by nonparental caregivers."

Is that not fascinating because I think that is kind of a common sense response that we all understand. As he said, if children are going to turn out well in day care, it is because of this quality issue, and the quality means that you are then making this tradeoff as a parent that if you are going to get good results, you are going to have a caregiver that is investing in your child's life in a way that replaces the care that you as the parent would have given which some parents are willing to make that tradeoff. But I think what you end up seeing is that the resistance that you get from parents toward commercial care is precisely for this reason because this is common sense. Parents understand this, and that is why you find that 73.5 percent of all preschoolers out there are cared for by family members because parents want their children to be influenced by people that they know and they love.

Senator COATS. Charmaine, I hate to——

Ms. YOEST. I have to stop?

Senator COATS. You are giving us great information, but our time is moving on, and if I could I want to try to move toward more of a back and forth discussion here.

Ms. YOEST. Sorry.

Senator COATS. I think the information you are giving is important for us, but if I could just ask you to summarize what you have, then we will try to open it up.

Ms. YOEST. OK. My very last point is that I, like you, Ellen, I hate that we have to polarize this, but when it comes to public policy, you are putting in place incentives and I am afraid that we are talking about putting into the public policy some perverse incentives. It is ironic to me that we are in the process of dismantling the welfare system because we recognize that the welfare system set up perverse incentives that started to displace the father in the family, and I am afraid that we are moving to set up perverse incentives to do precisely the same thing for the mother in the family.

Senator COATS. Thank you. Robert Rector, the question of tax policy has come up both in the first panel and in this panel indicating that with proper restructuring of taxes we can address this issue perhaps more effectively than we can with increasing the subsidies within the current system. Would you comment on that?

Mr. RECTOR. Yes, I would be happy to. The simple fact of the matter is that historically the United States in the 20th century had a family friendly tax code and now it has a family destructive tax code. If you went back to 1948 when a Republican Congress was crafting a family friendly tax code, you would find that the typical family of four, a husband and wife with two kids, paid three percent of its income to the Federal Government at that time in taxes. If you look at that same family today, they are paying 24 percent of their income to the Federal Government in direct taxes and if you add on indirect taxes and State and local taxes, it goes up to around 40 percent. That is a higher burden of extraction and exploitation than the typical serf faced during the Middle Ages, 40 percent of income going out by coercive means, out of the family and elsewhere.

Another factor that has gone on in the last 20 years is that government policies of overtaxation of investment and overregulation

of industry have retarded the growth of labor productivity, and that has meant that wages which, for example, in the 1950's and 1960's were going up very rapidly have leveled off. They have not gone down, but the rate of increase in wages, particularly for husbands, has leveled off, and what those two factors combined has meant that if families wanted to either stay at their same level or advance a little bit economically, they are forced to have the mother in the labor force more and more and more.

And what that means in very practical terms is that the typical mother in an employed family where the father is working and the mother is also working, that mother is not working to raise the family's standard of living. She is working predominantly to pay for this extraordinary growth in taxation that has occurred over the last 50 years. Now I would commend you, Senator Coats, and the Congress, in the last year you enacted the $500 per child tax credit. When that goes into effect—and let me emphasize this point—when that goes into effect, that will be the first real and sustained reduction in the taxation on families in the last half century by the Federal Government. But it is very modest. It knocks the direct Federal tax burden down from 24½ percent to around 23½ percent. It is a very, very modest first step. We have a long way to go.

And what I would suggest is that it took 50 years to roll those taxes up to this extraordinarily high level and what we need to begin is a course of rolling them back down year after year after year, and clearly in that tax policy, it should be a family friendly tax policy that is available to all families with children, particularly those with young children, and does not discriminate and say we give you a tax cut if you put your child in some form of stranger care, if you elect to put your child in some form of stranger care, we will give you a tax break, but if you make a huge financial sacrifice to keep one parent at home, generally the mother, well, we are going to ignore you.

And let me make one point on that. It has been alluded to earlier today, but if you look at the two basic families, families where the major users of day care are two-earner, two-parent families, those families when they have pre-school kids, have a median income of about $55,000 a year. On the other hand, if you look at families with at-home mothers, families where the husband is working and the mother is at-home with pre-school kids, their income on average is $20,000 a year less. They make about $35,000 a year. And to have a policy that says we are going to continue to tax those low-income families with at-home mothers in order to subsidize the more affluent families that choose to put their children in day care so that they can experience that greater level of affluence is, I think, both unfair and very socially dangerous.

Just in concluding this comment, we often hear remarks about how you do not want to pit stay-at-home moms against working mothers, and then that is the last thing you hear about stay-at-home mothers. OK. If you look at Hillary Clinton's book, It Takes a Village, she says how outrageous it is that you pit these two groups of mothers against one another, and that is the last reference to at-home mothers in the entire book. OK. So one way that we can avoid pitting those two groups against one another is to ig-

nore the at-home mothers entirely. That works very cleanly. It is very simple, and it is very unfair. We even have a policy and a lot of what comes out in the press of what I would call statistical genocide in which you put forward a whole bunch of statistics which are designed to prove that at-home mothers do not exist anymore and that all children are in day care and so forth. It is very, very pernicious. It is almost the most pernicious thing you could do to a social group is we are going to pretend that you do not even exist when, in fact, at least half, close to half of all preschool children do not have employed mothers and are at home with those mothers, and those mothers in particular and those families in particular need relief from this pernicious tax burden that has been imposed.

Senator COATS. Thank you. I would just like to ask Michael Lotito who is an expert in these areas are there legal restrictions or workplace policies that would work against the employer and employee setting up flexible type arrangements allowing say someone who is assigned to a second shift or third shift when a child is born to be able to work a different shift? If you have two parents working, they are each working the same shift, could adjustments be made in that? In this whole range of flex-time and so forth, what are the hurdles that we are faced with from a regulation standpoint and from a legal standpoint that prevent that kind of thing from happening? Or is that just employer practice? I mean they just are not sensitive to the needs of young families?

Mr. LOTITO. I think most employers are very sensitive to those needs but to specifically answer the question, and Ms. Blair referenced this in her remarks, there are laws that restrict employer-employee flexibility to come up with arrangements to meet their particular needs, and frankly, Senator, it is not too surprising that we have these laws because the Fair Labor Standards Act was enacted in 1938 where debates like this were not necessary because the woman was supposed to stay home, like my mother did, and probably never felt deprived by the fact that she did not go out and quote-unquote "have a real job."

The fact is we had 20 percent unemployment in the country, and we were trying to develop an incentive in order to make sure that employers would hire more individuals which is why we created time and a half after 40 hours in order to lower the unemployment rates, and that model, that statute, and all of the regulations that we have have been in place since 1938, and quite frankly the underlying reasons for them back in those days simply do not exist anymore, and I know that you know where I am headed with this with respect to the comp-time bill, which frankly and with all due respect, as they say, after listening to these presentations by this unbelievable group of experts here today, talking about comp time, in its modesty it is somewhat under-whelming that I would even have to raise it because all we are trying to do is to make sure that employees and employers, as a matter of choice, that they could work out between themselves and have some flex time with respect to scheduling hours over a period of a couple of weeks as opposed to 1 week, and be able to bank "x" number of hours with respect to comp time in order to give people some flexibility in order to meet these various kinds of needs.

As you know, of course, it has been passed in the House. The President says that he supports this, and we will not make this into a comp time hearing, but it is a mystery to me why the Senate just does not act. It is so—and, of course, I say that will all due respect, Senator, and hope you will still invite me back—but it is just a mystery because it so modest. With respect to some of the other issues that you raise, the ability of employers to move people around to respond to different situations, another fundamental premise of our labor law has been the recognition of seniority rights, whether it be in a collectively bargained situation or whether it be as a matter of employer policy, and oftentimes employers even in the nonunion environment will utilize these seniority systems because it establishes an objective way in order to be able to make an employment decision because they are so afraid of getting sued with the employment revolution that is going on in the country. And as a result of strictly adhering to those type of systems, it obviously does impact your ability to move somebody from shift A to shift B because they do not have more seniority, and as a result they cannot bump into that position, and even though the individual on the first shift wants to stay on the first shift because he wants to go fishing and the person on the second shift needs to come to the first to take care of the kid, seniority is more important than taking care of the child.

That again is a fundamental way that we have approached our labor laws for the last 50 years or so, and you talked earlier in summarizing the first panel of a national debate, a national introspective as to what kind of signals and what kind of policies are we really enacting here with respect to child care, and I think that there needs to be a fundamental look at these labor laws as well and to recognize—and not too surprising—that something that was done 50 years ago probably does not work very well today.

Senator COATS. It is interesting how the conversation here has turned back to the fundamental question we asked at the end of the last panel, and I would like our presenters or anyone else who wants to comment on this to speak further, but this whole question of, you know, the message that has been portrayed to our generation and the culture is considerably different, and you continually hear that, you know, it is not just what mothers want. There is an attitude toward the raising of children and a belief that two wage earners is important in today's society, not because they necessarily have to do so to pay the taxes, because they have to do so to meet the mortgage, but because that is part of our culture. How do we separate the two? I do not dispute at all Robert Rector's point that—in fact, I think it coincides a lot with Ms. Galinsky's point— that the tax burden today is such that it in many ways hinders, if not precludes, operating in a more traditional mode where one wage earner, at least when the child is young, one person goes out to earn the wage and the other stays home. But what is your reaction to what I have just mumbled here?

Ms. GALINSKY. I think that it is incredibly important to have a discussion about what is good for kids and I spent the last 3 years working on bringing the information about the brain development of young children to light because I think that it is so important to value nurturing children for the well-being of children. I guess

I want to make the further point, though, that for those families who do use care beyond their families, we need to value those people, too. I do not like the notion—I had not heard it before—but of commercial care or stranger care, and I kept thinking, my God, my husband was a stranger before I married him 41 years that I have known him later, but that, you know, we need to work toward durable and sustained relationships for children and families, and we need to really value the caring of children in whatever way we can. And interestingly enough——

Senator COATS. As a society.

Ms. GALINSKY. As a society.

Senator COATS. Which you would include from the public standpoint of how we structure our tax code to what our labor policies are to the private——

Ms. GALINSKY. Yes. And I want to say that the business community is perhaps a step ahead on this because when they first got into the area of providing family friendly programs and policies, they first thought that it was women and child care, and then they extended the focus to include men and the life cycle and elder care and time flexibility and all issues, and then they realized that you cannot have a program or policy achieve its intended effect if the culture does not support it and if supervisors do not implement it, and so you have seen, you know, not terribly widespread, but you have seen among a group of employers real efforts to change the culture of the workplace so that the supervisor can handle some of the kinds of problems that were described before in a win-win situation. But they realized that there is a self-interest, that there is a benefit. The benefit is kids and families, but the benefit can also be that their business will prosper when people feel cared for and nurtured in that environment.

So I think that we need—in the study that we just did in Florida, for example, where they did improve their regulations, they did not work to create a culture where that policy and program was supported, so that you cannot achieve its intended effects, in a sense, if the program or policy is not supported. So I believe that we need to move toward that next step if we are really going to help kids and families and the caregivers of kids and families.

Senator COATS. What about the question of whether subsidies actually encourage mothers to work more, not give them relief from the fact that they are already working, but they actually encourage—I think a GAO report in 1995, in fact, I know a GAO report in 1995 concluded that child care subsidies not only help parents with costs of out-of-home child care, but they actually encourage mothers to work more? How does that square with some of the studies either one of you have done and what your understanding of the mothers' true intent here?

Ms. OLSEN. Senator, my understanding of that study is that it actually is a relatively small effect. If you were to give full subsidies to all women who are coming off welfare, it would only increase labor force participation by 15 percent. So, in other words, the amount of child care subsidies that you provide does not really have much effect on whether or not these women go to work. Can I just take a second to respond to—really quickly? I can do a minute and a half on all of you guys.

Senator COATS. Sure.

Ms. OLSEN. Because everything you said was sort of linked. Moms who stay at home or dads who stay at home and moms who work and dads who work are not at odds, and there is a real easy way to address them. Parents in this country want freedom. They want the best things for their kids and they want to be able to have the ability to get it. If it is an educational preschool when the kid is four, they want to be able to afford it. If it is staying home with the kid 24 hours a day until they are 6, that is a parent's decision, and—this is no offense as well—it is not a politician's decision. Those decisions are best made by parents because parents love their kids, parents know their kids, and they know what is best for them.

They can use the research that everybody has talked about today and they should. But these are decisions about child care that should be made by parents and certainly not the politicians, and the best way to restore that freedom for all families is with a tax cut. It is real easy. It is real simple. That would give moms who want better day care more money for that kind of day care. It would give the moms who want to stay home more money to be able to stay home. Most moms, we know, prefer to stay home if they can. Regardless, that is a parent's decision, and the best way to give parents that freedom is with a tax cut, plain and simple.

Senator COATS. Let me throw out something that came up in the first panel to Robert Rector. I do not know, Robert, if you heard. The suggestion was made that if, as I think the majority conclusion was in the first panel, that the best thing we can do for children is to provide some kind of sustained continuous care by a single caregiver, preferably the parent, particularly in the earliest of years, the question was should we revisit the welfare reform law to provide—maybe you were here during that—to provide at least in the first several months, 6 months, 12 months, a scaled basis for requiring a welfare mother to be at home for a certain number of weeks, part-time work or whatever, and not put a full-time work requirement on until say 12 months, 24 months or whatever?

Mr. RECTOR. I would be delighted. In fact, I wanted to squeeze that in so I am very happy to have that opportunity.

Senator COATS. I am glad I asked the question.

Mr. RECTOR. We listened to the child development experts talk about the effects of day care, and Professor Belsky described it perhaps as a drizzle. Well, there are two other factors that are not a drizzle. They are downright floods in terms of harming a child's development, and those happen to be illegitimacy and welfare dependence. The longer a child stays on welfare, the more number of years they spend on AFDC, holding every other conceivable social variable constant, the lower will be that child's IQ compared to a similar poor mother who is a single mother who is working. The fact of the matter is—and that is not a modest effect—it is not a drizzle—it is a huge, very large effect. If you look at the effects of being born out of wedlock and raised in a single parent family and almost any variable you could look at, it is decisively, profoundly negative in terms of the child's well-being. That is why Congress reformed the welfare system. They reformed it because illegitimacy and welfare dependence were harmful for children, not because day

care was good for them, and what we need in order to get the best environment for children, I believe, is we need to promote marriage, we need to promote self-sufficiency, and I believe also we need to promote at-home care.

That does not mean that a single mother at home alone with a welfare check year after year after year was ever a good environment for raising children. In fact, the literature is overwhelming that that is not good for kids.

Therefore, we reformed the welfare system in order to promote marriage and self-sufficiency. It is a huge leap and an illogical leap to say, therefore, that what this means is we ought to subsidize and put middle class kids into day care.

One other point on this, I think it is very important, is that there is nothing in the law that requires welfare mothers with very young children to be required to work or to get off the caseload or anything like that. There is nothing in the law that does that. In fact, the real performance standards in the law simply require States to reduce their caseloads by about 40 percent by the year 2002, something like that. They can fully exempt every child—they could actually exempt every family with children under age 5 because half the welfare mothers do not have any pre-school children. They can exempt large numbers of children and still meet those performance standards if that is their choice. I think we should leave it up to the States to make that determination. But I do think that we have to realize that welfare dependence and doing anything to encourage welfare dependence and out-of-wedlock births is not a good thing for kids.

Finally, one related point to this that I think is very important. You are not taking credit for how much money is actually available in existing law for day care. Under the existing law, a State can use the entire TANF block grant for day care if they want to do so. There is nothing to block them from doing that and spreading it out among low-income families. That amounts to about $100 billion over the next 5 years that is available for day care at the State level. In fact, that funding is automatic because as the States' welfare caseloads go down and welfare mothers move into work, the States do not lose money anymore. They garner a surplus. And what that actually means is that you kind of have a formula in the law, implicitly in the law, that every time the welfare caseload in a State goes down by one case, that frees up about $5,000 that that State can then use for day care. And if the caseload went down by 50 percent, you would, in effect, be liberating $50 billion over the next 5 years that is perfectly available for day care or any other service that they want for these low- income mothers or for other low-income families. It is a huge, huge amount of money, and so when people talk about what we increased the child care and child development block grant in the bill, that is a pittance compared to the profound structural change that says as welfare dependence goes down, all of the surplus funding, all of it, if you wish, at the State level can be used for day care or child development or medical care or anything else that you need to meet the needs of these low-income parents. It is a good policy and I do not think we have explained to the general voter exactly how good it is.

Senator COATS. Thank you.

Ms. GALINSKY. I want to make a point sort of on top of that because often the debate, you know, in my theme of polarization talks about Washington raising children when there is Federal money, and we have to remember that we really have a system of State and local decision-making about this Federal money. This is not. So States can choose. And it is a State's choice, and increasingly we see States developing what we call community mobilization efforts where States are really trying to use some business strategies to figure out how to meet the needs of children and families where they have a vision of what they want their community to look like, where they assess their needs based on their vision, where they develop strategies to resolve that, and where they benchmark their progress.

I mean we have collected books of examples about this going on around the country, and I think that the money that comes from the Federal Government to help children and families is being used in very local ways. Just like families need to solve problems, communities are using it. Some are using it well; some are not using it well. But it is really being used in that way. So I think we need to shift the debate from it is Washington raising children to really this is supporting communities to solve their own problems.

Second, I just wanted to make one other point which is the research on the impact of parental employment. We have looked at that over the years, and what you find is it is not it is good or it is bad. What the research shows is that there are several things that make a difference in terms of how children fair. The first is one that has been mentioned here which is whether families are doing the thing that they believe is right for their children. The second is money, which particularly for low-income families, tend to be a good thing—more money in the system. The third is, and it has been left out of the discussion, but parents' jobs, what parents' jobs are like does tend to be brought home both in the terms of the values by which we raise our children and in the stress or satisfaction that we bring home to our children. And the fourth is what happens to the children when they are away from us in child care. So it is not kind of it is good, it is bad; it depends on a number of factors.

Ms. CRITTENDEN. Can I take the debate even a step further back?

Senator COATS. Sure.

Ms. CRITTENDEN. I think in general we should be saying to all levels of government, to paraphrase a popular radio talk show host, you are not my kid's mom. And I think parents, as Darcy Olsen has said very persuasively, will do the right thing for their kids if they have their tax burden decreased. I think there are a couple of things government or deregulation in the corporate field could do. I think certainly reviving the old concept of alimony to protect women who take time out of the workforce, which does affect their long-term wages, could be a good thing. I think looking at the regulations on corporations and also just the litigation atmosphere that surrounds corporate changes today. I mean you read now, and Mr. Lotito could probably tell us whether this is true or not, but you know any policy sort of put in place to help parents, let alone mothers, gets challenged because another employee, whether they are

senior or not, says, well, gee, if you are giving time off to take care of your kids or flexibility, my golf game is important, and I think you are discriminating against me as a single person, and why should people with children enjoy any other rights that people without children do? And I think we are getting into a very strange atmosphere where we even have to discuss the value of parents to their children, that we have to have a long panel today to talk about how can we help parents be with their kids. I mean I think it just shows how much society has changed in a generation, and I think freeing up a lot of cash in those parents' pockets—I get very mistrustful of any government solution, right or left. I think it always has perverse consequences. I think the tax credit for stay-at-home mothers for Republicans can have, you know, equally—I just do not think you can control people socially through government policy. I do not think you should try to, and I do not think it ever has, as we have seen with our welfare State today, has the consequences that one hopes it will have from the right or left.

And I think just sort of trying to make our tax code neutral, permitting corporations to hire and decide their work schedules that will best suit their employees, and right now, given the labor shortage, corporations have a huge incentive to treat their female workers especially well, and to come up with very creative solutions to keep those female workers, and I think if they were allowed to do that, we would be so far ahead that we would not be sitting here having a commission on massive government day care and whether it is a good idea because we would not need it. People would have the choices that they need and could make them.

Ms. YOEST. Can I jump in?

Senator COATS. Yes, if you could briefly. Our time has expired. I will try to wrap it up.

Ms. YOEST. Oh, sorry.

Senator COATS. But please jump in with a last thought here.

Ms. YOEST. Real quickly. I was really struck in looking at this research and thinking about the issue of perverse incentives that 41 percent of the families who claim the dependent care tax credit make over $50,000 a year. So in terms of, you know, our cultural messages that we are sending out, we are saying in order to claim the DCTC, the money that you spend on child care has to go to generate income. So what we are saying is that the family over here that makes $50,000 can get a tax credit from the government if they are both working, but the family that makes $20,000 and has one parent at home cannot.

And I wanted to address—Ellen mentioned the research that shows that children do better if their family feels—well, anyway, that there is a connection between the way the parents feel about the child care and how the parent does, and specifically the research on that shows that children do better if the mother feels a little conflicted about leaving her child, and I believe it was again Dr. Belsky who speculated that this is because this promotes her, it shows that she feels more, she is continuing to keep this connection alive with her child that she stills conflicted. But as a woman, my heart kind of broke as I read that because I thought what is this saying about our society that in order for these children to maintain their attachment to their mothers, their mothers are

going to have to continue in this State of psychic dissonance about their lives, and I do not think that you are going to find very many women who are able to tolerate that level of psychic dissonance. And so in order to tolerate that, they are going to have to distance themselves from that grief that they are feeling.

Senator COATS. Thank you. I want to thank our presenters, all four of them, and our responders, all four of them, and the entire panel, both panels, for what I think is a hugely instructive and important debate that I believe strongly needs to precede any type of legislative action that the Congress might take this year. It is my goal to use this record as a basis of informing my colleagues, giving them more information and more questions to ask before we simply sit down and evaluate which of the child care proposals before us are we going to vote on. I think these proposals have gotten far ahead of the fundamental underlying questions that need to be addressed and need to be answered, and I hope to make that very much a part of the debate this year as we evaluate what we will do on child care. And your contributions to that effort have been extremely important to me and to the other members that have come and to those who will benefit from reading and understanding what it is you are attempting to bring to us. So we thank you for that. And look forward to what will, hopefully, hopefully this year, be a constructive debate on the broader questions of what do children in America really need and what do parents really want and what can we do to either facilitate that need or get out of the way of hindering that need. So thank you all very, very much for attending, for our presenters for their work in preparing and being part of all this, and with that this symposium is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 4:50 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

ISBN 0-16-056513-8